The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXV, No. 3 September, 1946

CONTENTS

The Catholic Church's Attitude Towards Labor Relations *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 161

The Ancient Newness of Dogma . *Walter P. Burke, C.S.P.* 169

"Attende Lectioni" . . . *Luke Missett, C.P.* 186

Simulated Consent. Part III . *Thomas Owen Martin* 193

The Sources of Modern Attacks Against the Church *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 204

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The "Religious Book List" Again 219

Anesthesia of a Dying Person 221

Transfer of the *Missa pro populo* 222

Is the Eucharistic Fast Broken? 223

A Question of Income Tax 224

Material and Shape of the Monstrance 224

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States, $4.00; Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1946, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

Use of the Communion Cloth 225

Obligation of the *Sanctus* Candle 226

ANALECTA 227

BOOK REVIEWS

Apologetica, *by G. Yelle, S.S. and R. Fournier, S.S.* . . 230

De ecclesia et de locis theologicis, *by G. Yelle, S.S.* . . 230

Economic Analysis and Problems, *by John F. Cronin, S.S.* . 231

Caeremoniale, Pars Prior, de ministris
by J. F. Van de Stappen, revised by Aug. Croegaert 233

The Priest of the Fathers, *by Edward L. Heston, C.S.C.* . 234

Personality Factors in Counselling, *by Charles A. Curran* . 235

BOOK NOTES 238

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

We Solicit Your Co-operation

Notice of change of address should be sent to us promptly, and at the same time the old address should be given.

Sometimes a subscriber overlooks reporting change of address; and now and then a subscriber dies, and in either case his copy continues to be sent to his former address. In such cases notification from Successor or Pastor would be appreciated.

You May Use the Blank Below:

NAME: .....

OLD ADDRESS: .....

NEW ADDRESS: .....

OTHER INFORMATION: .....

The American Ecclesiastical Review
The Catholic University of America
Washington 17, D. C.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS LABOR RELATIONS

No one can doubt the deep interest of the Catholic Church in economic problems affecting the temporal welfare of mankind. A convincing proof of this interest is found in the detailed authoritative statements of recent Popes, providing the Catholic solution of problems concerning the mutual rights and obligations of capital and labor, the organization of trade unions, the living wage, etc. Beginning with Pope Leo XIII, the author of the *Rerum novarum,* all the Sovereign Pontiffs, including our present Holy Father, have spoken definitely and clearly on some of the many complicated questions pertinent to economic and social conditions.

We can grasp adequately the Church's teachings on these material and mundane matters only when we perceive clearly the reason why the Church regards them as pertaining to her competence and as worthy of her attention. To those who hate the Catholic Church and are eager to attribute to her every policy a sinister, worldly motive, the efforts of ecclesiastical authorities in behalf of workers is nothing more than a demagogic appeal for their loyalty, the hypocritical assumption of a friendly and sympathetic attitude toward the proletariat for the purpose of retaining or making them devoted slaves of the Church. In a similar manner, according to these enemies of Catholicism, the main reason why the Church denounces contraception is to increase her membership.

Neither of these two charges is worthy of a detailed refutation. Anyone familiar with the teachings and the activities of the Catholic Church is fully aware that the Church's opposition to birth control is motivated by her zeal for God's law, not by desire of worldly aggrandizement, and that her interest in the material prosperity of the less fortunate classes is not a mere bid for loyalty. At the same time, it sometimes occurs that persons friendly to the Church misinterpret in another manner the activities of the Church in behalf of the laboring classes. They regard such activities as directed primarily to the temporal alleviation of the poor, with which they are directly concerned. Such persons view the Church as an influential, public-spirited organization that has embarked on a noble crusade to eliminate poverty and to eradicate injustice and to bring contentment to mankind through a spirit of human sym-

pathy and kindness—but nothing more. They praise the wisdom and the prudence of the Popes in their farsighted social policies, and admit that if these policies were universally put into practice peace and prosperity would reign in the world—but there they stop. Even Catholics, proud that prominent personages have been so lavish in their commendation of the Church's social doctrines, may be led unconsciously to make this naturalistic interpretation their own and may come to visualize the Church's interest in economic and social problems as primarily and *per se* a magnificent manifestation of her zeal for the temporal amelioration of human life.

Such a concept of the Church's social program is gravely erroneous, for it entirely omits, or at least relegates to a place of comparative unimportance, what is actually the chief objective of the Church in all her efforts to better the material conditions of mankind—the sanctification and the salvation of men's souls. However varied may be the activities of the Church, however earthly they may seem to be, their main purpose must ever be spiritual and supernatural. If the Church made the temporal welfare of men her chief concern even in a single instance, she would be unfaithful to the mission she received from her Divine Founder. As Pope Pius XI expressed it: "The Church was not given the commission to guide men to a merely fleeting and perishable happiness, but to that which is eternal. Indeed, the Church holds that it is unlawful for her to mix without cause in these temporal concerns."[1] Accordingly, when the Church upholds the right of private individuals to own property and the right of laborers to a living wage and the right of workers to form unions, her principal objective is not the earthly happiness the exercise of these rights will procure. Her goal in enunciating the doctrines dealing with these human rights—not merely as a general ultimate end, such as is supposed to be the final motive of all Christian activity, but as a definite and direct objective—is the promotion of spiritual benefits, immeasurably more precious than the transitory material blessings her activities and her influence may procure.

What precisely are the spiritual benefits the Church strives to

[1] *Two Basic Social Encyclicals.* Latin Text with English Translation, Approved by the Holy See (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1943), p. 111.

obtain by teaching and applying to practice doctrines relevant to man's temporal prosperity? In the first place, the Church regards it as a great blessing that the correct teaching on these subjects be promulgated, and she is conscious of her right and duty to proclaim truths of morality as well as of faith. As Pope Pius XII declared: "It is the indisputable competence of the Church on the side of the social order where it meets and comes into contact with the moral order to decide whether the bases of a given social system are in accordance with the unchangeable order which God, our Creator and Redeemer, has shown us through the natural law and Revelation."[2] That God's law be proclaimed in all truth, with its detailed applications to the conditions of everyday life, is a boon, even abstracting from the extent to which it is observed by the children of men.

Secondly, since unjust economic and social conditions are sinful in themselves and furnish the occasion of more sins, the Church deems it her duty to protest against such conditions and to eliminate them, as far as she can. From this standpoint, the Church raises her voice in protest against the manifold social evils in modern times, not primarily because they cause misery and unhappiness among men, but because they constitute an offence against God. Dr. Furfey stresses this point in *The Mystery of Iniquity:* "The function of the Catholic Church is to carry on the redemptive work of Jesus Christ, to sanctify and save men through the Christian religion. The Church has no interest in economics precisely as such any more than in mathematics or physical chemistry. It is only when economic matters impinge on her work of salvation that the Church becomes aroused. If, for example, workingmen are paid unjustly low wages, then she must be concerned; for the situation means sin for the employers and an occasion of sin for the employees. Under such circumstances the Church encourages the use of whatever natural or supernatural means seem appropriate to meet the problem. But always her point of view is supernatural. The salvation of souls is her concern. The natural becomes important only in so far as it touches on the supernatural."[3]

Thirdly, included in the scope of the Church's mission is the

[2] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XXXIII (1941), 218.

[3] Rev. Dr. Paul Hanly Furfey, *The Mystery of Iniquity* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1943), pp. 122 f.

duty of defending the dignity of the human person—not merely the natural dignity possessed by man because his soul is made to the image and likeness of God, but particularly the supernatural dignity belonging to him because he is destined to eternal bliss in the company of the Holy Trinity. For the proper development of his personal dignity, man needs the possession and the use of a reasonable measure of temporal goods; and the Church is bound to use her authority and influence to secure for every man such a measure of prosperity. Pope Pius XII expressed this objective of the Church in these words: "The native right to the use of material goods, intimately linked as it is to the dignity and other rights of the human person . . . provides man with a secure material basis of the highest import, on which to rise to the fulfilment, with reasonable liberty, of his moral duties. . . . The economic riches of a people do not properly consist in the abundance of goods, measured according to a purely and solely material calculation of their worth, but in the fact that such an abundance represents and offers really and effectively the material basis sufficient for the proper personal development of its members."[4] Hence, the economic security which the Church strives to assure to everyone is viewed by her principally as a means rather than as an end—a means of helping each individual to perfect the supernatural dignity that is his divinely granted prerogative as an actual or potential member of the Body of Christ.

It follows that priests who take an active interest in labor and economic problems by preaching the Church's doctrines on these subjects or by promoting associations of Catholic workingmen are performing a task within their competence as representatives of the Church. Similarly, it is incumbent on those familiar with Catholic theology to apply its moral doctrines to the complex ethical problems that are constantly arising in our modern industrial age. Anyone who would deny to priests the right to participate to this extent in economic activities and controversies would logically deny the right of the Church to mingle in matters concerning man's material prosperity.

However, certain norms must be observed by those Catholics—particularly priests—who devote themselves to the promotion of the Church's economic program. In the first place, they must not become

[4] *AAS*, XXXIII (1941), 221 f.

so engrossed in the material aspects of their task as to lose sight of its all-important spiritual objectives. We cannot, indeed, expect every Catholic to spend all his time sermonizing whenever he takes part in a gathering treating of labor problems. But, on the other hand, he may never forget that he is supposed to exercise an apostolate. For example, a priest who by virtue of his contacts with industrial groups frequently associates with non-Catholics should take advantage of the opportunity of getting them interested in the Catholic Church. Or, he may meet Catholics who have become careless in the practice of their religion, and he should strive to induce them to return to the sacraments. He should bear in mind the counsel of Pope Pius XI, that special retreats for workers be conducted by the clergy.[5] Such activities the priest must regard, not as accessories to his social activities, not as tasks of supererogation, but as essential features of the project in which he is engaged as an official delegate of the Church, whose vital concern is the spiritual well-being of those whose material conditions she is improving.

Again, when Catholics—whether clerical or lay—praise the Church's solicitude for the temporal welfare of the poor and the unfortunate, they should explain the predominant motive of this service, the spiritual regeneration or preservation of the recipients. It is inspiring to recount the story of St. Peter Claver, spending his days in the reeking slave-markets of Carthagena in order to bring relief to the wretched victims of the white man's greed, and to picture Fr. Damien giving his life for the lepers of Molokai, and to tell the story of St. Frances Cabrini, taking to her bosom the neglected little ones in the streets of New York. Beyond doubt, such accounts of the saintly social workers of the Catholic Church encourage Catholics to go and do likewise and serve to break down the prejudice of non-Catholics by rectifying in some measure their notions of the Catholic Church. But if those who listen to these stories are left with the impression that the Church is nothing more than a great humanitarian organization, a kind of Red Cross society under the direction of the Popes, the very soul of Catholic social service has been passed over unnoticed.

Similarly, when Catholics explain the teachings of the social encyclicals, they may not content themselves with pointing out the justice and equity of these papal pronouncements, their wise and

[5] *Two Basic Social Encyclicals*, p. 191.

practical applications of the natural law. True, many of these doctrines are based on natural law; but their very life blood is the supernatural spirit that pervades the documents in which they are contained. There is a certain amount of gratification in hearing non-Catholics, and even non-Christians, unstintingly praise the social encyclicals, yet the question must arise, how far they really understand them. The Catholic creed is a logical whole; it is difficult to comprehend the full significance of a certain portion unless one perceives the consistency of Catholicism in its entirety. In explaining Catholic social doctrines to those not of our faith it is our duty to point out that, according to our belief, these tenets must be taken in conjunction with the other doctrines of Catholicism, in their complete supernatural bearing, and that only in this sense do we attribute to them full efficacy in solving social and industrial problems. The natural law alone will not save a race that has been ordained to a supernatural destiny. Today the words of Pope Leo XIII are just as true as when he uttered them more than a half-century ago: "If human society is to be healed, only a return to Christian life and institutions will heal it."[6] To perceive the full force of this quotation, we must bear in mind that in the official language of the Church "Christian" is synonymous with "Catholic."

Moreover, in defending and propagating the Church's teachings on the rights of the poor and of the laboring classes, Catholics must avoid stirring up class hatred. Underlying the Popes' social teaching are, indeed, deep sympathy for the poor and an ardent desire to obtain justice from employers and the wealthy. Neverthless, Catholics who undertake to expound the social doctrine of the Church must not allow their utterances to degenerate into violent diatribes against those who are blessed with wordly riches or vehement denunciations of capitalists and employers as a group. That is not the spirit of the encyclicals nor the spirit of Christian charity which the Catholic Church regards as an indispensable condition of social amelioration. Pope Leo XIII made this point very clear: "It is a capital evil with respect to the question we are discussing to take for granted that the one class of society is of itself hostile to the others, as if nature had set rich and poor against each other to fight fiercely in implacable war. This is so abhorrent to reason and truth that the exact opposite is true. . . . Neither capital can do

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

without labor, nor labor without capital."[7] In the same strain, Pope Pius XI wrote to the bishops of Mexico in 1937: "In some cases the defence of the dignity of the human person will necessitate the frank denunciation of unjust and unworthy living conditions; but at the same time great care must be taken lest violence be approved on the pretext of remedying the sufferings of the masses."[8]

Finally, in proclaiming the Church's desire to better the earthly lot of the poor, Catholics must not give the impression that the Church is anxious to make everyone rich. The Church does indeed teach that moderate prosperity is a goal to be aimed at for all, and particularly that type of prosperity which includes family ownership of a tract of land. "It is the spirit of *Rerum novarum,*" Pope Pius XII tells us, "to state that, as a rule, only that stability which is rooted in one's own holding makes of the family the vital and most perfect and fecund cell of society, joining up in a brilliant manner in its progressive cohesion the present and future generation."[9] Pope Pius XI taught that it is desirable that workers be given sufficient wages "to attain gradually to the possession of a moderate amount of wealth,"[10] and that "justice cannot be said to have been satisfied as long as workingmen are denied a salary that will enable them to secure proper sustenance for themselves and for their families; as long as they are denied the opportunity of acquiring a modest fortune and forestalling the plague of universal pauperism; as long as they cannot make suitable provision through public or private insurance for old age, for periods of illness, etc."[11]

Evidently, the economic condition which the Church desires the workingman to attain as the best suited for the spiritual development of his personality is very different from what is commonly designated as wealth or affluence. The Church does not condemn the acquiring of riches as intrinsically evil, nor assert that those who cherish the ambition to become wealthy are guilty of sin. Nevertheless, the attitude of the Church toward those who have a great abundance of material possessions is clearly expressed by Pope Leo XIII, when he emphatically reminds the rich of their obligation to practice charity and tells them that "wealth is of no

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 23.
[8] *AAS*, XXIX (1937), 193.
[9] *AAS*, XXXIII (1941), 224.
[10] *Two Basic Social Encyclicals*, p. 137.
[11] *AAS*, XXIX (1937), 92.

avail unto the happiness of eternal life but is rather a hindrance."[12]

Neither should Catholics assure those who observe the laws of justice and charity that they will infallibly be successful from the material standpoint. Generally speaking, the observance of the laws of God in labor relations will produce the greatest measure of prosperity; but we have no certainty that this will be true in individual cases. The employer who pays a just wage may fail in business, while his dishonest competitor may become wealthy. Those who accept the Church's norms of right and wrong in the conducting of temporal affairs should be warned that the only reward they can expect with certainty is a spiritual remuneration from God.

In fine, the attitude of the Catholic Church towards labor problems is similar to the attitude of Christ in reference to the economic conditions of those with whom he came in contact during His earthly life. Rich and poor alike were the objects of His love; yet He did not hesitate to show His special preference for the poor, becoming one of them and "embracing with special love the lowly and those harassed by injustice."[13] But whatever favors He bestowed on those who were in temporal need—whether it was health of body or food miraculously multiplied or words of comfort and solace—His primary objective ever and always was the spiritual profit of those who were the recipients of His divine bounty. For the basic theme of His teachings and labor was the solemn dictum: "What does it profit a man if he gain the whole world but suffer the loss of his own soul?"[14]

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[12] *Two Basic Social Encyclicals*, p. 29.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 33.
[14] *Matt.* 16:26.

MISSION INTENTION

"An Increase of Love for the Missions through Teaching, Writing and Preaching" is the Mission Intention for the month of September, 1946.

THE ANCIENT NEWNESS OF DOGMA

The charge of "dogmatism" is the usual accusation that any forceful writer of Catholic convictions must expect. But as Chesterton retorted to Arnold Bennett: "In truth, there are only two kinds of people, those who accept dogmas and know it, and those who accept dogmas and don't know it."[1] This two-edged thrust of G. K.'s could well be aimed at Carlyle, who found himself so ruffled by Cardinal Newman's apparent dogmatism that he made the unwarranted assertion that Newman possessed "the brain of a moderate sized rabbit."[2] The truth of the matter is that in Newman's writings on Catholic dogmas we find the great mind of the Nineteenth Century really at its best.

The intense realization of the ancient newness and beauty of Catholic dogmas sparkles all through his writings. He is ever conscious, ever in wonderment at the dynamic realities, the vital truths, the power and significance of the dogmas of the Church. His appreciation of them makes the colorless black columns of Denziger-Bannwart really come to life. For after all, words and terms express true ideas—the images by which, through the mysterious power of the mind, we actually come in contact in an intensely intimate way with the realities which these ideas represent.

Newman's glorification of the dogmas of the Church can hardly then be considered extravagant. For him, the definitions, the symbols, the dogmatic statements are the trophies "set up in record of the victories of the Faith."[3] The Athanasian Creed is "a war-song of faith,"[4] "a hymn of praise to the Eternal Trinity."[5] The definitive pronouncements of the Church are the catalogued treasures of God's own mind as revealed to man.[6] They are ever

[1] Maisie Ward, *Gilbert Keith Chesterton* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1943), p. 217.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909), p. 315.

[4] *Sermon Notes* (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1913), pp. 318 f.

[5] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908), II, 270.

[6] *The Via Media of the Anglican Church* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897), p. 209.

"springing into life with inexhaustible fecundity,"[7] ever blossoming forth from the perennial Vine of Christ. The anathemas and *de fides* are trumpet blasts of the Church Militant "drawing the line between truth and heresy."[8] It is by means of these masterful formulae that the Church has ever been able "to anticipate or remedy the various aberrations of wrong reason; to combat pride and recklessness with their own arms, and thus to triumph over the sophist and the innovator." "The overthrow of the wisdom of the world was one of the earliest as well as the noblest triumphs of the Church."[9]

There is a master idea behind the writings of Newman which gives the key to his appreciation of the dogmas of the Church. It parallels one of the basic principles in the intellectualism of St. Thomas, who states: "Intelligence is a form of life, and of living things, it is the most perfect."[10] So, too, for Newman, the master idea of his intellectualism is that truth is a dynamic living thing. As long as a truth endures, it must be always manifesting the characteristics of a principle of life. It must be active and growing. It must constantly be perfecting and developing itself in the minds of men without suffering any substantial change within itself. Thus the dynamic life of a truth is its cause of development. And the norm for determining whether or not the doctrinal development of a truth is a genuine development or merely a corruption is that the development possess the characteristics proper to a real living thing. Hence the master idea of Newman regarding dogmas might be summed up in this statement: The living quality of truth is not only the cause of developments but also the criterion for judging a true development of doctrine.[11]

Newman, an intellectual genius and profound psychologist, has a tremendous insight into the dynamic life of dogmas and their developments because, from his own personal experience, he is so

[7] *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909), p. 148.

[8] *Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford*, p. 313.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 313 f.

[10] St. Thomas Aquinas, *In XII libros metaphysicorum*, I, 5.

[11] Wilfrid Ward, *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1921), I, 87.

much aware of the intensity of life in the realms of the intellectual. The spirit-world, the sphere of the intellect and the will, is Newman's real word. His writings seem always pregnant with a vision of that spirit-world. Perhaps we might describe that vision as that of a man who views the world of human minds as a mighty sea sparkling with myriads of individual spirit-principles of activity and life, acting and interacting on one another. Added to them and coursing among them with mighty clashes and collisions are the millions of individual ideas acting upon the minds of men, and in turn, being acted upon by them. For each human idea is itself a principle of life and activity. It is in this unseen world of ideas and human minds, vibrant beneath the drab world of sense and space and time, that human life and activity reach their highest peak, their whitest heat. It is such a vision that enriches Newman's analysis of the ebb and tide of thought-trends in history, the birth and death of false philosophies, the crooked course of heresies from corruption to decay, and the perennial life and beauty of ancient Christian dogmas.

Illustrative of this vision is the following passage from the Preface to Newman's *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*:

> When an idea, whether real or not, is of a nature to arrest and possess the mind, it may be said to have life, that is, to live in the mind which is its recipient. Thus mathematical ideas, real as they are, can hardly properly be called living, at least ordinarily. But when some great enunciation, whether true or false, about human nature, or present good, or government, or duty, or religion, is carried forward into the public throng of men and draws attention, then it is not merely received passively within them, leading them to an ever-new contemplation of itself, to an application of it in various directions and a propagation of it on every side. . . . Let one such idea get possession of the popular mind, or the mind of any portion of the community, and it is not difficult to understand what will be the result. At first men will not fully realize what it is that moves them, and will express and explain themselves inadequately. There will be a general agitation of thought, and an action of mind upon mind. There will be a time of confusion, when conceptions and misconceptions are in conflict, and it is uncertain whether anything is to come of the idea at all, or which view of it is to get the start of others. New lights will be brought to bear upon the original statements of the doctrine put forward, judgments and aspects will accumulate. After a while, some definite teaching emerges; and as time proceeds, one view will be modified or expanded by another, and

then combined with a third; till the idea to which these various aspects belong, will be to each mind separately what at first it was only all together. . . . It will, in proportion to its native vigour and subtlety, introduce itself into the framework and details of social life, changing public opinion, and strengthening or undermining the foundations of established order. Thus in time it will have grown into an ethical code, or into a system of government, or into a theology, or into a ritual, according to its capabilities: and this body of thought, thus laboriously gained, will after all be little more than the proper representative of one idea, being in substance what that idea meant from the first, its complete image as seen in a combination of diversified aspects, with the suggestions and corrections of many minds, and the illustration of many experiences.

This process, whether it be longer or shorter in point of time, by which the aspects of an idea are brought into consistency and form, I call its development, being the germination and maturation of some truth or apparent truth on a large mental field.[12]

He continues farther on: "In time, it enters upon strange territory; points of controversy alter their bearing; parties rise and fall around it; dangers and hope appear in new relations; and old principles reappear under new forms. It changes with them in order to remain the same. In a higher world it is otherwise, but here below to live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often."[13]

The real richness of Newman's master idea of the living quality of truth and the intensity of life in the intellectual order is not fully seen by viewing it in itself as we have done, but rather in seeing its actual application to the nature of a dogma and to the development of a dogma. As conscious as Newman is of the dynamism of ideas and their revolutionary effects, still, he does not stray from the path of orthodoxy. There is also permanence in the reality of the spirit-world. There is always the objectivity and changelessness of truth itself.

Newman's notion of a dogma is an orthodox one even though it lacks the precise terminology of the Schoolmen or the Vatican Council. He does not state: "A dogma is a truth revealed by God

[12] *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909), pp. 36 ff.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

and as such, directly set forth by the Church for us to believe."[14] But he does express its equivalent. Newman insisted that his position agreed substantially with that of his critic, Perrone, the Roman theologian.[15] At the same time, he submitted his *Essay on Development* to the Catholic authorities in case they would consider necessary any theological revision.[16]

In Newman's various statements on the notion of a dogma, the elements of the Vatican definition are clearly present along with the application of his master idea to the nature of a dogma: "Theological dogmas are propositions expressive of the judgments which the mind forms, or the impressions which it receives of the Revealed Truth."[17] "These articles were all hidden, as it were, in the Church's bosom from the first, and brought out into form according to the occasion."[18] ". . . a dogma professes to be a direct contemplation, and, if so be, a definition of what is infinite and eternal . . ."[19] Newman states rather decisively the authoritative part of the Church in a dogma. "Every Catholic holds that the Christian dogmas were in the Church from the time of the apostles; that they were ever in substance what they are now; that they existed before the formulas were publicly adopted, in which, as time went on, they were defined and recorded, and that such formulas, when sanctioned by due ecclesiastical acts, are binding on the faith of Catholics, and have a dogmatic authority."[20]

The above quotations certainly clear Newman of any possible taint of Modernism as regards the nature of a dogma. The Kantian subjectivism and relativity of truth as found in the writings of Schleiermacher and Loisy are a far cry from Newman, who looks upon revealed truths as eternal and changeless. For the Modernist, dogmas are merely the ephemeral bubbles of sentiment raised upon the surface of the sea of the inner religious experiences of

[14] E. Dublanchy, "Dogme," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1911), IV, 2, col. 1575.

[15] Wilfrid Ward, *op. cit.*, I, 185.

[16] *Ibid.*, I, 99, 615.

[17] *Via Media*, II, 40.

[18] *Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford*, p. 320.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 325.

[20] *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908), p. 333.

mankind. But for Newman, a dogma is as changeless and as objective within itself as the reality it represents. Thus he writes: "Surely, if Almighty God is ever one and the same, and is revealed to us as one and the same; the true inward impression of Him, made on the recipient of the revelation, must be one and the same; and, since human nature proceeds upon fixed laws, the statement of that impression must be one and the same, so that we may as well say that there are two Gods as two Creeds."[21]

Newman is a staunch supporter of the infallibility of the Church in matters of dogma.[22] The rebellion against the authority of the Church which characterized the Modernists has no place with Newman. He was aware that even the forerunners of Modernism were being swept along by the revolutionary thought-trends and social changes which were bubbling up as early as the times of Lammenais. In Newman's essay on Abbé de Lammenais' "Affaires de Rome" he quotes some of the more powerful passages on the revolutionary ideas and changes then sweeping the continent. Newman wrote this essay even before the fall of Lammenais and he has this to say of the abbé's writings: ". . . there is just that ill flavor in his doctrine to make one tremble, lest, under disappointment, he should be led to deny the authority of religion."[23] It may be remarked further that Newman would have preferred to re-edit his *Essay on Development.* Cardinal Wiseman, however, examined the book and advised Newman to leave it in its original terminology lest any modifications might cause it to lose currency with the Anglicans.[24]

So much for the orthodoxy and proper understanding in Newman as to the nature of a dogma. It is with his application of his master idea to the notion of a dogma that we are chiefly interested. As is evident from the quotations from Newman regarding the nature of a dogma, he is well aware that a dogma is composed of two elements: a formula, and a divine truth. The formula of course is the organized group of terms which contain and express

[21] *Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford,* p. 328.

[22] *Apologia pro vita sua* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1905), pp. 250 f.

[23] *Essays Critical and Historical* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910), I, 173.

[24] Wilfrid Ward, *op. cit.,* pp. 99, 615.

the divine truth. Even in his appreciation of the formulae, we see the master idea of Newman in action, beholding the formula as itself a living thing and participating in the vitality of the truth that it expresses.

For Newman, the aesthete and mystic as well as historian, the formulae themselves possess a perennial power and beauty. He refers to these formulae as a "watchword . . . distinguishing Christians from infidels."[25] They are outlines of sound words[26] and abstracts of saving faith.[27] "It is the temper of reverent faith to feel this; to feel that in coming to the Church, it stands before God's representative, and that, as in her Ordinances, so in her Creed, there is something supernatural and beyond us."[28] In his *Via Media,* Newman tells us that "history bears witness to the fact" that the Apostles' Creed is "the treasure and legacy of faith."[29] "In like manner, it was called the *Regula Fidei* or rule of Faith, as the formulary, by which all statements of doctrine made in the Church were to be measured and estimated."[30] Of the Athanasian Creed, he confesses: "For myself, I have ever felt it is the most simple and sublime, the most devotional formulary to which Christianity has given birth, more so even than the *Veni Creator* and the *Te Deum.*"[31]

Newman views the formulae as partaking of some of the active power of the truth which they enclothe and at the same time manifest, just as the human body does of the soul: "To object, then, to the number of propositions, upon which an anathema is placed, is altogether to mistake their use; for their multiplication is not intended to enforce many things, but to express one—to form within us that one impression concerning Almighty God, as the ruling principle of our minds, and that, whether we can fully recognize our own possession of it or no."[32]

Yet it must be admitted that Newman does not put too much stress on the beauty and vitality of the formulae themselves, since he is enthralled rather by the truth which they contain. Perhaps it is because he does not have a thoroughly developed epistemology which would bring out clearly the intimate relationship of the term

[25] *Via Media,* I, 218.
[26] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 249.
[27] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 240.
[28] *Ibid.,* p. 257.
[29] *Ibid.,* p. 218.
[30] *Ibid.,* p. 219.
[31] *Grammar of Assent,* p. 133.
[32] *Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford,* pp. 336 f.

to the vital concept it expresses. In the principles of St. Thomas, we see the mental processes of conception and definition as identical; and the term as the perfect expression of the object grasped by the mind.[33] The formula then is readily comprehended as very intimately sharing in the life of the truth it contains and manifests.

Newman himself admits that by nature and sentiment he prefers the simple beautiful scriptural language of the days of the *disciplina arcani*.[34] His pious sensitiveness and mystical other-worldliness are not soothed by the thought of bloodshed, and suffering, and loss of immortal souls involved in the formulation of such terms as ὁμοούσιος and others. He sees the formulae as the tools of human reason, the powerful arms which the Church Militant has had to take up in order to defend herself against heresies. He admits that without precise formulae the Church is hampered in her defence against attacks just as she was against Arianism before Nicea.[35] But it is always the truth of God contained within the formula that Newman emphasizes. At times, he so stresses the beauty, the riches, and the depths of the divine truth expressed by the formulae that he seems to obscure the vitality and beauty which he actually does maintain to be present in the formulae themselves.

It is in this second element, the truth of a dogma, that the master idea goes into real action. Newman is always filled with awe and wonderment at the majesty and the fecundity of God's revealed truth. This is the "pearl of great price" for Newman, and he sees it ever prolific in life and beauty and yet as substantially changeless as it is ancient. It is not only because human minds are limited active principles which only gradually deepen their comprehension of a truth that we have doctrinal developments. It is chiefly because the words of God are fountains "springing up unto life everlasting."

Thus Newman writes:

> This is a phenomenon proper to the Gospel, and a note of divinity. Its half sentences, its overflowings of language, admit of development;

---

[33] Pierre Rousselot, S.J., *The Intellectualism of St. Thomas* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909), pp. 102 f.

[34] *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908), pp. 36 ff.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 141.

they have a life in them which shows itself in progress; a truth, which has the token of consistency; a reality, which is fruitful in resources; a depth, which extends into mystery: for they are the representations of what is actual, and has a definite location and necessary bearings and a meaning in the great system of things, and a harmony in what it is, and a compatibility in what it involves. What form of Paganism can furnish a parallel? What philosopher has left his words to posterity as a talent which could be put to usury, as a mine which could be wrought?[36]

It is this living quality of the divine truth in the dogma that not only causes but necessitates the development of doctrine. Newman describes its action in a typical development:

Let us quit this survey of the general system, and descend to the history of the formation of any Catholic dogma. What a remarkable sight it is, as almost all unprejudiced persons will admit, to trace the course of the controversy from its first disorders to its exact and determinate issue. Full of deep interest, to see how the great idea takes hold of a thousand minds by its living force, and will not be ruled or stinted, but is "like a burning fire," as the Prophet speaks, "shut up" within them till they are "weary of forbearing and cannot stay," and grows in them, and at length is born through them, perhaps in a long course of years, and even successive generations; so that the doctrine may rather be said to use the minds of Christians, than to be used by them. Wonderful it is to see with what effort, hesitation, suspense, interruption,—with how many swayings to the right and left—with how many reverses, yet with what certainty of advance, with what precision in its march, and with what ultimate completeness, it has been evolved; till the whole truth "self-balanced on its center hung," part answering to part, one, absolute, integral, indissoluble while the world lasts! Wonderful, to see how heresy has but thrown that idea into fresh forms, and drawn out from it farther developments, with an exuberance which exceeded all questioning, and a harmony which baffled all criticism, like Him, its Divine Author, who, when put on trial by the Evil One, was but fortified by the assault, and is ever justified in His sayings, and overcomes when He is judged.[37]

The above passage is beautifully illustrated by the whole history of the doctrinal development of the Incarnation. One cannot help but surmise that the passage is a rich abstract drawn from the Car-

[36] *Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford*, pp. 317 f.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 316 f.

dinal's tremendous study and writings on the Christological heresies. Here in one paragraph, he has x-rayed the turbulent yet colorful and complex course of the doctrine from the time of its first revelation to its final formulation at Chalcedon. St. John, inspired by the Holy Spirit, writes: "The Word was God . . . and the Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us."[38] In these simple yet richly pregnant words, St. John expressed the tremendous truth that God had really and truly become man, a truth that was clearly taught in the Gospels and Epistles, preached by all the apostles and held by all the faithful of the ancient Church. Yet this was not enough.

The mighty truth of the Incarnation was like a bomb-shell that burst amidst the pagan fortresses of Platonism, Manicheism, and pessimism. It acted like a piece of phosphorous on the stagnant waters of the pagan philosophies that formed the dead sea of the minds of fallen men. Then followed four turbulent centuries of controversies. The intellectual realms of the ancient world surged with new life and became a raging sea of mind clashing with mind, and heart with heart, in the attempts of men to interpret and penetrate this new truth that had come down from heaven in the person of the Son of God.

The whole Christian world became embroiled in a life and death struggle with the Gnostic "higher wisdom" of the world which attempted to twist and corrupt this mighty truth of God into tiny fables about demiurges and intermediate beings. Against each heretic, God raised up a giant of sanctity and intellectual brilliance to preserve the divine facts with the protective armor of steel-cut formulae. On the anvil of heresy and human obstinacy, amidst the heat of controversy and even the shedding of blood, these formulae were hammered out and delicately fashioned. The warlike Athanasius turned the tide against the Arians with the term ὁμοούσιος and at Nicaea preserved the divinity of Christ. Cyril at Ephesus in 431 with the term θεοτόκος defeated the Nestorians, who tried to destroy the intimate union of humanity and divinity by insisting on two persons in Christ. Gregory Nazianzen maintained the νοῦς or rational soul in Christ against the Appolinarists and thereby preserved the integrity of the humanity of the God-Man. Finally, Leo the Great vanquished Eutyches, who pro-

[38] *John* 1:1, 14.

claimed that after the union of the humanity and divinity in Christ, the human nature was completely absorbed and swallowed up, as it were, in Christ's divinity.

It was then that St. Leo, guided by the Holy Spirit, wrote infallibly in a manner that crystallized four centuries of intense human activity spent in the protecting and the comprehending of the simple statements of the Gospels and Epistles which had told men that Jesus Christ was truly God and truly man. In his dogmatic letter to Flavian, Leo expressed the same changeless truth as John and Paul and the others before him; but he expressed it in a formula which manifested a real growth in men's comprehension of what God had wrought with the coming of the Saviour into the world. He phrased it in a delicately balanced formula which clarified the truth and at the same time excluded the errors and corruptions of Arianism, Nestorianism, Appolinarism and Eutychianism. Thus three hundred years after John and Paul, their words of revelation were sheathed in these terms:

> . . . we all confess and teach with one accord, one and the same Lord Jesus Christ, perfect in His divinity and perfect in His humanity, true God and true man, having a rational soul and body, consubstantial with the Father in His divinity and consubstantial with us in His humanity . . . one and the same Christ . . . to be confessed in two natures without confusion, without change, division or separation, for the union does not destroy the distinction of natures but rather each retains its own being and characteristics, and is united to the other in one person and hypostasis.[39]

Of this dogmatic statement enunciated by Leo, of this doctrinal development of the Incarnation, Newman's words are most appropriate: ". . . with what ultimate completeness, it has been evolved; till the whole truth 'self-balanced on its center hung,' part answering to part, one, absolute, integral, indissoluble while the world lasts."[40] This dogma as expressed by Leo is for Newman like the other dogmas of the Church. They are the deathless enunciations of Saints and Scholars, of men like Athanasius and Cyril and Leo and Gregory who spent their lives that the ancient

[39] H. J. Schroeder, O.P., *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1937), p. 83.

[40] Cf. *supra*, p. 177.

beauty and fecundity of divine truth might never be lessened or obscured.

Yet Newman was not content with merely stating that the dynamic life of truth is the cause of doctrinal developments. With his master idea, he penetrated even more deeply into this historical phenomenon. For he saw that every living thing, whether it be in the physical order or in the intellectual order, follows very definite laws in its growth. A thing which is really alive follows an obvious pattern of development and possesses very definite characteristics in its progress. That is why a true growth is easily distinguished from a mere corruption. Newman, in his *Essay on Development,* sets down seven characteristics which are common to living things and especially proper to a living dogma.

The seven qualities of a true growth or development which he proposes are that a true growth must be characterized by: "A Chronic Vigour," "A Preservation of Type," "The Power of Assimilation," "Continuity of Principle," "Logical Sequence," "Conservation of Action," and "Anticipation of The Future."[41] Since these seven qualities are always essential to any true growth, then it follows that they can be used as sound criteria for distinguishing a real doctrinal development from a mere corruption or heresy. An easy way to perceive the truth of this line of reasoning is to apply these seven characteristics to some living thing in the physical order, such as an oak tree, and see the principle illustrated in a concrete manner. Then by way of parallelism, apply it in the intellectual order to a living dogma such as the Incarnation. Then it is clearly seen that these seven notes form a reliable norm for judging whether a doctrinal development is a true growth or merely a heresy.

Take for example the first note, "Chronic Vigour,"[42] as applied to an oak tree, and then as applied to the doctrine of the Incarnation. An oak tree is a living thing. Therefore, it has within it a principle of life or self-perfecting activity. Hence as long as an oak tree is alive, it must be always growing and developing and perfecting itself. So, too, a living truth must be always manifesting a perennial growth and development, for the sphere of the intellect is life at its highest intensity. The doctrine of the Incarnation is characterized by this note. For the truth that "The

[41] *Essay on Development,* pp. 169-206. [42] *Ibid.,* p. 207.

Word was God . . . and the Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us,"[43] has never ceased to grow in the comprehension of itself by human beings. And the depth of its meaning has had an inexhaustible fecundity not only for the minds of men of the caliber of Paul and Augustine and Thomas but for the minds of men of all ages. It has very definitely a "Chronic Vigour."

The second note, "Preservation of Type,"[44] is but another way of saying that any living thing must maintain its substantial identity of nature even while it grows and changes. Thus an oak tree does not turn into a box hedge or a cedar tree but remains always an oak. Likewise the essential truth of a doctrine and its intrinsic identity must persist. In the Christological development, the essential truth of the Incarnation as revealed in Scripture has been maintained. For the fact that Christ is both God and man has not been altered by Nicaea or Ephesus, or Constantinople, or Chalcedon. That is why Arianism lacks this note. It corrupts what is of the very essence of the truth: the divinity of Christ.

The third note, "Power of Assimilation,"[45] means that a living thing must be able to absorb into its own substantial unity elements which are external to it and which help it in its course of growth. There must be a real affinity between the living thing and these elements, and their absorption must take place without it suffering any loss or alteration of its own substantial identity. So it is that an oak tree nourishes itself with the chemical elements in the soil, and the air, and the rain, and absorbs them without losing its nature as an oak, or turning into earth and air itself. It does not absorb what it does not have a natural affinity to and hence is not corrupted.

In the intellectual order, a truth has a natural relationship to the activities of human minds and to other true ideas. For truth, whether revealed or unrevealed, is the proper object of the human intellect whether the intellect be that of a pagan or a Christian. The body of Christian Revelation is also related to the bits of truth of the primitive revelation already scattered throughout the pagan world beforehand. Thus the living truth of the Incarnation marshalled to itself large theological groups and attracted the activity of many minds upon itself. That which was good and true

[43] *John* 1:1, 14.

[44] *Essay on Development,* pp. 171 f.

[45] *Ibid.,* pp. 185 f.

and related to it was used while that which was evil or heretical or utterly foreign was rejected. Philosophical phraseology and Aristotelian logic were absorbed and used for the perfecting of men's penetration of the one truth. The term ὁμοούσιος was cleansed of any wrong connotations and assimilated by the doctrine while the compromising Semi-Arian ὅμοιος was rejected. Despite this assimilation of external elements, there is still no essential difference in the truth as expressed at Chalcedon or as expressed in the prologue of St. John's Gospel, though there is a very definite growth in the minds of men as regards their penetration and comprehension of the Incarnation.

The fourth note, "Continuity of Principle,"[46] signifies that every living thing has very definite laws or principles by which it nourishes and perfects itself. This regulating law of growth flows from the very nature of the thing and is proper to it. As such, it is as changeless as the nature of the thing itself. The principle of growth for an oak tree is that of osmosis and absorption. It could not suddenly begin to masticate and forage for itself for then its nature would have been changed into that of an animal. The essential principle of growth for a philosophy is the activity of human reason. In theology, it is faith and reason, with faith being supreme. All through the true developments of the Incarnation, the law of development was that of the supremacy of faith over reason, for this is the principle of growth for any truth of Revelation. It was when reason was placed superior to faith and usurped the function of faith that heresy resulted. This was the dominant characteristic of the whole heretical Gnostic movement.

The fifth note is "Logical Sequence,"[47] which means that developments of any living thing must be proportionate to and flow naturally from the very nature of the thing. They must, as it were, be at least virtually contained within it. A conclusion naturally and logically flows from its premises; so, too, the branches of a tree from its trunk. It would be unnatural and illogical for the trunk of an oak tree to suddenly put forth the branches and needles of a hemlock tree. Its logical sequence is to put forth branches with the same grain and bark and leaves proper to an oak tree. Thus a true development can never be contrary or contradictory to the essence of the truth from which it is derived. When the Second

[46] *Ibid.*, pp. 178 f.

[47] *Ibid.*, pp. 189 f.

Council of Constantinople condemned Monotheletism and insisted on the two wills in Christ, it was merely maintaining the logical sequence of development. For the existence of two wills flows logically and necessarily from the fact that there are two intelligent free natures in Christ. Docetism was significantly illogical for if Christ is true man, He must necessarily and logically possess a true human body. To postulate a mere material husk which is only the appearance of a body is to contradict the fact that Christ is really and truly a man with a real human nature.

The sixth note is "Conservation of Action":[48] any new development of a living thing must also protect and preserve all that has come before it. The new branches of an oak tree do not kill the old branches of the tree but are a new source of nourishment and strength for the rest of the tree. Any true doctrinal development must possess a similar conservation of action. For there must not only be a new growth in the understanding of the essential truth but this new development must also fortify and protect what is already known about the truth. Thus Chalcedon preserves and improves what was achieved at Nicaea and Ephesus and Constantinople regarding the Incarnation. Monotheletism obviously corrupts what was achieved in those councils for it destroys what is essential to Christ's human nature—a free will.

The seventh note, "Anticipation of the Future,"[49] means that every living thing manifests very definite tendencies in its early stages of growth. These tendencies are maintained throughout the whole course of its development, if no corruption or essential change takes place; for these tendencies flow from its very nature. Thus in looking on the life history of an oak tree, it will be observed that in its early stages of growth it manifested the same characteristic tendencies as it did in all of its later stages of development. On close examination, an oak seedling manifests the same grain and bark and branch design and leaf formation as the mighty oak of future years. In viewing the history of the development of a doctrine, we should be able to observe the same orthodox and traditional tendencies persevering and being maintained in its later developments. Ephesus is a good example of this. It certainly anticipated Chalcedon in condemning Nestorianism. In maintaining only one person in Christ, it set the way for Chalcedon to ex-

[48] *Ibid.*, pp. 199 f.

[49] *Ibid.*, pp. 195 f.

plain how there is only one person in Christ and its relation to the two natures. Both Constantinople and Chalcedon manifest the same tendency by insisting on a complete and integral human nature for Christ, and each council did this in its own way.

The striking element of this whole dynamic theory is that amidst all of Newman's stressing of change and growth, he never fails to emphasize at the same time the essential changelessness of the doctrine itself. This is especially evident in his seven criteria. Though he insists that a true doctrine must always be characterized by a chronic vigor, still, it must also be characterized by a very definite immutability within itself. For over the whole course of its development, the doctrine must maintain an identity of nature, an identity of essential tendencies, and an identity of laws of growth. Even the least development must conserve that identity of nature and flow logically from it. Anything which violates this rigorous law of identity is a mere corruption.

Newman is always aware that the growth of a doctrine takes place in the minds of the recipients and not in the revealed truth itself. There is no change in the original revelation nor in the inner consciousness of the Church as regards the revelation which she knew she possessed even from the beginning. For the Church, the growth is the *transitus* from implicit awareness to explicit formulation. By analogy, the facts of a case history are presented to a doctor. He studies them and thereby draws out very explicit conclusions actually contained in the facts already stated. He does all this without any necessary change taking place either in the facts or in the condition of his patient. So, too, for Newman as for any Catholic, the revealed truth remains ever the same but the comprehension of all that is contained therein increases with the passing of time and the activity of human minds upon the object. Amidst this expansion of understanding on the part of her members, the Church is always accompanied and guided by the authority and enlightenment of the Spirit of Truth working among the members of Christ's Living Body.

As original as is Newman's theory on the development of doctrine, it is far from being completely new. He admits that both De Maistre and Moehler on the continent have preceded him in handling the problem.[50] Yet Moehler's and Newman's approaches

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

are quite different. Moehler's is that of a dogmatic theologian while Newman's is that of a philosopher of ecclesiastical history. Moehler treats of the subject from the point of view of the Church as a living organism of which the Holy Spirit is the vivifying principle.[51] Doctrinal developments are thus seen as but the unfolding of the life of the Church.[52] They are the formal acts of the Mystical Body of Christ. Newman deals with the subject apologetically. He starts with the life of truth and the intensity of life in the intellectual order which characterize any field of human activity. In this way, Newman is on common ground even with those outside the Church. Yet the approaches of both men are quite compatible with one another. Both writers are well anchored in the traditions of the past. The writings of Tertullian, Irenaeus, Petavius and Vincent of Lerins do not allow either of them to be ranked as radical innovators.[53] Not infrequently, Newman refers to Vincent of Lerins and also quotes a very striking passage from Tertullian regarding the development of doctrine.[54]

It is a significant fact that the last writing of Newman as an Anglican was his *Essay*. It was begun just as he was finishing his long journey from Oxford to Rome. In it, he glorifies "the beauty ever ancient ever new" that he found in the dogma of Catholicism. The *Essay of Development* is almost a *Te Deum* which he composed while standing outside the very threshold of the Church.

WALTER P. BURKE, C.S.P.

St. Paul's College,
Washington, D. C.

[51] G. Voss, S.J., "Johann Adam Moehler and the Development of Dogma," *Theological Studies*, IV, 1 (March, 1943), pp. 420-44.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 444.

[53] *Ibid.*, pp. 443 f.

[54] *Essay on Development*, pp. 10-27, 362 f.; cf. also *Via Media*, I, 51, 73.

AN EXHORTATION FOR CATHOLIC ASSEMBLIES

Strive then to come together more frequently for God's eucharist and glory. For when you come together often, the powers of Satan are destroyed and his wickedness is dissipated by the concord of your faith.

—St. Ignatius of Antioch, *The Letter to the Ephesians*, 13:1.

"ATTENDE LECTIONI"

"For every ten good preachers, there is only one good reader," the professor of sacred eloquence asserted dogmatically. Exaggeration? I thought so when I first heard it but the more I listen to priests read the Epistles and Gospels, pastoral letters, announcements and prayers, the more I am inclined to think that the statement is true.

What is the reason for this dearth of good readers? Why should there be more skilled preachers than readers? Is it due to a lack of interest in the art of reading? Most priests are interested in preaching. They read books on sacred eloquence; they strive to correct their faults and improve their pulpit efficiency. Many ecclesiastics daily subject themselves to vocal gymnastics and preach eloquent sermons to the chairs in their rooms. But how many clerics ever practice reading aloud? Why so much stress on preaching and so little on reading? Is it that we are blind to the importance of reading? Or is it that we harbor the impression that we are good readers? Possibly it is a combination of both.

Yet the ability to read well is very important for every priest. He has the solemn obligation of making known God's revelation. The delivering of God's message contained in the Epistles and Gospels is far more important than the expression of the ideas contained in his sermon. The priest who reads the inspired word of God with intelligent and vivacious expression preaches a sermon that will far outlive anything that he has to say in his own discourse. There are no words of human wisdom that can move hearts as the inspired word of God.

The prayers after Mass, novena prayers, and the prayers connected with the administration of the sacraments, if read well, can stir effectively the wills of the auditors. Within my experience has come the case of a man who was so impressed by the intelligent reading of the burial prayers that he became interested in the Church and ultimately became a Catholic. The instruction at the marriage ceremony, if read well, will do much to impress the bride and groom with the dignity and sacredness of Christian marriage. Yet, too often this instruction is read as if it were a multiplication table.

Finally, a priest is required to read the parish announcements each Sunday. That the people hear and understand the announcements is necessary for the smooth running of the parish. Yet, how many times do parishioners leave their Church with incomplete or vague ideas on important parish affairs? I know one pastor who had a curate removed because of the indistinct manner in which he read the announcements.

Since reading plays such a vital part in the life of a priest, it is no wonder that St. Paul wrote to his disciple Timothy, exhorting him: "Attende lectioni."[1] Dr. Callan, O.P., in his commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, says: "The injunction here is primarily to the public reading of the Sacred Scriptures to the faithful in their assemblies."[2] It is interesting to note that St. Paul first exhorts Timothy to attend unto reading and then unto preaching. "Attend unto reading, to exhortation and to doctrine."[3] Does not this seem to indicate that St. Paul considered the public reading of the Scriptures more important than preaching?

The art of reading is really much more difficult than the art of preaching. The main problems of preaching—proper enunciation, good resonance, flexibility and colorfulness of voice—apply also to reading. Reading, however, being a distinct type of vocal expression, has its own peculiar traits of character which the reader must take into consideration.

Preaching is a matter of putting ideas and feelings into words; reading is a matter of turning words into feelings and ideas. The two do not work the same way at all, though the effects may sound alike. Preaching demands the expression of ideas already formed. Reading demands apprehension and vocalization of ideas already expressed.[4]

The first task of the public reader is to grasp the intellectual content of what he is going to read. He must turn the symbols or words into ideas and then the ideas into speech. Some readers make the fatal mistake of turning words directly into speech sounds. As a

[1] *I Tim.* 4:13.

[2] Rev. Charles Callan, O.P., *The Epistles of St. Paul* (New York: Joseph Wagner, Inc., 1931), II, 285.

[3] *I Tim.* 4:13.

[4] Cf. Charles Woolbert and Joseph Smith, *Fundamentals of Speech* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1934), pp. 451-83.

result their auditors receive only speech sounds, not ideas. The old Scholastic axiom, *nemo dat quod non habet,* applies here. To read well, one must make the thoughts of the author his own.

The obligation of studying the Scriptures in order that we might read them intelligently was enjoined upon us by the bishop who ordained us to the order of lector: "Studete verba Dei, videlicet lectiones sacras, distincte et aperte ad intelligentiam et aedificationem fidelium . . . proferre, ne veritas lectionum incuria vestra ad instructionem audientium corrumpatur."[5]

The priest who does not study the Epistles and Gospels before reading them is not fulfilling his obligation. For an intelligent reading of the Scriptures, one must know as much as he can of the author's meaning. To extract the treasures of divine wisdom contained in the Scriptures, one must be conversant with their setting. One must know the purpose and the occasion of the passage, the people to whom it was addressed and the meaning of the ideas and words employed by the sacred writer. In a word, one must study a commentary. *The Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and Holydays* (New York: W. H. Sadlier, Inc., 1941), prepared with brief exegetical notes by the Catholic Biblical Association of America, will prove an invaluable aid. Five minutes employed in perusing the brief notes will make one acquainted with the logical setting which is so necessary for intelligent reading. Is it too much to ask a priest to devote five minutes to preparing God's message?

The reader's task is not finished when he has translated the dead words of the printed page into living ideas. He has the further obligation of conveying those ideas to his auditors. He can accomplish this by proper grouping or phrasing, by inflection and by employing the various means of emphasis.

In normal conversation a person makes known his ideas to others by uttering his words in groups, by stressing important ideas through inflection and by employing other means of emphasis. His auditors generally have no trouble in understanding what he means. Yet, too often when a book is placed in the same person's hands, he will cease to be natural. He will utter all his words in a steady, unstressed manner like falling rain. Such reading is monotonous and very often meaningless. To avoid this the reader should strive to read as he speaks in normal conversation. He must

[5] *Roman Pontifical, De ordinatione lectorum.*

endeavor to group his words and to give prominence to important ideas.

Clark and Babcock in their splendid book on the mental technique of speech define grouping as follows: "Grouping is breaking up the text into ideas or speech units."[6] The various marks of written punctuation enable the reader to extract the ideas from the printed page. They help him to get the sense of the passage. The listener, however, can not *see* the relationship between words. It is therefore incumbent upon the reader that he indicate the relationship between words by means of proper phrasing or grouping. In this matter it is important to remember that written punctuation does not directly determine the grouping. Punctuation marks enable the reader to grasp the sense, and the sense alone determines the phrasing. Not every comma calls for a pause, nor does the absence of punctuation indicate that no pause is required. This may be best illustrated by an example from the work of Ernest Lègouvé, a member of the French Academy:

"Read the line again, sir."

"The Oak one day, said to the reed . . ."

"There! You can't read! I told you so!"

"But . . ."

"But," interrupts Samson, cold and dry, "But why do you join the adverb to the noun rather than to the verb? What kind of an Oak is an Oak one day? No kind at all! There is no such tree! Why, then, do you say: The Oak one day, said to the Reed? This is the way it should go: The Oak (pause) one day said to the Reed. You understand, of course?"

"Certainly I do," replies the pupil, a new light breaking in on him. "It seems as if there should be an invisible comma after Oak!"

"You are right, sir," continued the master, "Every passage has a double set of punctuation marks, one visible, the other invisible; one is the printer's work, the other the reader's."[7]

Another classic example of how improper pausing can change the meaning of a passage is the case of the priest reading St. John's Gospel. This is how he read one particular sentence: "There was

[6] S. H. Clark and Maud M. Babcock, *Interpretation of the Printed Page* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1940), p. 3.

[7] Ernest Lègouvé, *The Art of Reading* (quoted from Clark and Babcock, *op. cit.*, p. 6).

a man sent (pause) by God his name was John." Imagine the reaction of the congregation!

How frequently should we pause in our reading? We should make all the pauses we think necessary in order to have our listeners get a maximum of our meaning with a minimum of effort on their part. The nature of oral reading demands that we pause more frequently than we do in normal conversation. Pausing enables the reader to look ahead and get the next idea and enables the listener to digest the idea just presented. The number of pauses will depend greatly on the difficulty of the text and the size of the audience; the more difficult the text and the larger the audience, the greater the number of pauses. However, the speech units should never become so short as to make the reading choppy or to bring about the separation of the words and phrases from their modifiers.

The next step for the reader in interpreting the printed page is to take care to convey the exact meaning by giving due prominence to main ideas. The ideas in a particular sentence are not all of equal weight. In every well-constructed sentence there is one main idea. In the same way, in connected discourse there are sentences which mean more than others—for example, topic sentences. Speech units of sentences which bring out main ideas must be given due prominence. This is done with words or groups of words by taking more time for their utterance, by pausing before or after the words, by a change of pitch or inflection, by a change of force.

The good reader often makes his main ideas stand out by taking plenty of time to utter the words that express them. He expands them, draws them out, lingers on them, thus giving his audience a chance to get the full meaning.

The pause is an even more effective means of centering attention on an important idea. It makes the preceding idea prominent or serves to throw into bold relief an important or startling idea that is to follow.

Inflection is the upward or downward swing or bend of the voice from the average pitch. Proper inflections help more than anything else to convey the idea of importance or subordination. In using inflections, however, the reader must be on his guard against the constant repetition of the same inflections. There is the danger that the reader will, through habit, create for himself a

certain melody which he will repeat over and over again. Good reading demands variety of inflection.

Dropping the voice at the end of each sentence and beginning the next sentence on a higher pitch should be scrupulously avoided. The falling inflection denotes finality—completeness of thought. Hence it is evident that the falling inflection should be employed only at the end of a paragraph; for, if the paragraph be well constructed the meaning is not complete till the end is reached. Sometimes a falling circumflex accent, which may be described as a rise and fall in pitch, may be employed at the end of sentences to denote partial completeness. Instead of lowering the voice at the end of every sentence, the general rule should be to keep it up. If the reader does this he will find it far easier to maintain the attention of an audience. For his discourse will acquire liveliness far beyond the apparent simplicity of the means adopted. The reading of a paragraph with falling inflection at the end of each sentence, compared with the reading of the same paragraph according to the method suggested above, will convince one of the desirability of the latter.

The last means of emphasis is force. Either by increasing the loudness of a word or phrase, or by pointedly reducing its loudness, the reader may make that word or phrase stand out as if it had been underscored.

Stressing different words may completely change the meaning of a sentence. Hence it is of the utmost importance to stress the right word. Emphasis on the wrong word may distort the meaning of a whole sentence. The reader must carefully consider just what word must be stressed in order to convey the exact meaning of the author. Stressing too many words in the same sentence will not only fail to serve the purpose of emphasis but will obscure the main idea. Too much stress produces the very opposite of the desired effect.

The reader's task is not finished when he has conveyed the exact meaning of the author. He must also portray the emotions which the author has expressed in his writings. In most reading there are not only thoughts to be expressed but also emotions or feelings. In the sentence from the Gospel, "My house is a house of prayer but you have made it a den of thieves," there is the thought that the house of God has been desecrated by trafficking in money and there is the feeling with which it is said—one of righteous indignation. Most of the Sunday Gospels are highly

charged emotionally and it is the duty of the priest not only to convey Our Lord's meaning but also His feelings. Feeling is the soul of utterance. Without the true rendering of feeling, there will be monotony. Feeling gives life, energy, variety, and interest.

To portray feeling effectively the reader must, by means of his imagination, recreate the scene and place himself in the same circumstances in which the author experienced the emotion. He must try to see what the author saw, and feel what the author felt. It is not until he has done this that he will be able to portray effectively the emotional content of the passage. For it is only when one truly experiences the emotion that he will assume a tone of voice that will adequately express the emotion. The reader will do well to keep in mind the admonition of Horace, "If you wish me to weep, you must first weep yourself; then your misfortune will cause me sorrow . . . if you say badly the parts assigned to you, then I shall either sleep or laugh."[8]

The last problem which confronts the reader is the management of the book. He must learn to hold the book so that it will neither hide his face nor deflect his voice. Refraining from poking one's nose into the book is a harder job than it may appear to be. Again, the eyes of the reader must not be always on the page; they should turn continually from the page to the audience. The ability to do this requires practice, but the reader must acquire this facility if he hopes to maintain audience contact. Such actions as the management of the book and looking at the audience may seem little things. They are. But proficiency in any art consists in mastering such details.

From what has been said it is evident that reading plays an important part in the life of a priest. Reading is not "grammar school stuff" but a most difficult art. If the priest heed the admonition of St. Paul, "Attende lectioni," he may be confident that the promise the bishop made in conferring upon him the order of the lectorate will be fulfilled: "Accipite, et estote verbi Dei relatores, habituri, si fideliter et utiliter impleveritis officium vestrum, partem cum iis, qui verbum Dei bene administraverunt ab initio."[9]

Holy Cross Seminary,
Dunkirk, New York

LUKE MISSETT, C.P.

[8] *Ars poetica,* vv. 102 ff.

[9] *Roman Pontifical, De ordinatione lectorum.*

SIMULATED CONSENT

Part III

The Chancery Office of the diocese in which the hospital was located sent an auditor and a notary to interview John Holmes[1] according to the questionnaire and instructions[2] enclosed in the rogatory commission[3] forwarded to them by the presiding judge of the court which was hearing the case of Mary Carson Holmes. When John's answers were returned to the trial court, properly authenticated by the notary of the diocese in which the testimony had been taken, the members of the tribunal studied them carefully. John's deposition was not proof against the validity of the marriage, of course, since it was the statement of a party thereto,[4] but it was evidence which could be used, as far as it contained admissions of such validity, to prove the contrary position, namely that the marriage was valid.

Reading John's deposition the judges found that prior to the marriage in the presence of the Justice of the Peace he had taken Mary out on several dates. He had not planned on marrying her. She was a nice girl, and he rather enjoyed her company, but he was not ready to settle down to married life and its responsibilities at that time. He had intended to hold on to his heart and to keep their relationship light. He had, in fact, dated several girls because he did not want any one of them to get the idea that she had a hold on him.

Unfortunately, Mary had been pretty serious about the whole thing, more so than he had thought. Then, one evening, their emotions had carried them away. He had worried about the consequences, but she had not said anything to him and he had breathed a sigh of relief, feeling that perhaps it was not going to be too bad after all. Finally, however, the blow which he had feared had come. She was going to have a baby. Thinking it over he had

[1] Cf. Can. 1570, § 2.

[2] Cf. Can. 1770, § 2, 3°.

[3] Cf. Instruction to be observed by diocesan tribunals in handling cases of nullity of marriages, S.C. Sacr., Aug. 15, 1936, *AAS*, XXVIII (1936), 313 (Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, II, 471-530; Doheny, *Canonical Procedure in Matrimonial Cases*), hereinafter cited by articles, Art. 98.

[4] Cf. Art. 117.

decided that the only decent thing he could do under the circumstances was to marry her in order to save the situation.

This decision was not so easy to carry out, however, because in the meantime he had enlisted. That step he had taken while he was under the impression that nothing would come of the episode, and, of course, having enlisted, he had to go through with it. He did not feel that he could tell Mary at that time the real reason for his departure, for she was so upset that she would have done something violent, he feared. Consequently, he had said that he was merely going way on a business trip. She had been less upset over that, and had accepted his assurance that he would return to marry her before the baby should be born.

He had come home later on furlough and when he was able to get away from all the friends and relatives who wanted to see him and who were continually demanding that he come and visit them he had met Mary and they had got married. At boot-camp he had met a fellow who had been married before and then had got a divorce and had remarried. This man was a Catholic and his first marriage had taken place before a Justice of the Peace. John had figured that Mary could do the same as that boy had done. He did not believe that she would care to continue to be married to him. After all, their marriage had not got off to a very good start. Then, too, he hoped that she would divorce him, so that he could be free until he should find someone with whom he wanted to spend the rest of his life.

Mary had not liked the idea of a marriage before the Justice but he had held out for that because he did not want her to feel later that she had been trapped by him. In that case she would not, if married in Church, have been able to get a divorce. He knew how Catholics felt about those who got divorced and remarried. If he walked out, as he then intended to do, after a Church marriage, she would probably hate him for the rest of her life. If he had to face the possibility of her hating him it would be more difficult for him to leave her, for, after all, he did not want her to feel too badly toward him. It was bad enough as it was. Consequently they had been married by the Justice of the Peace.

John had not counted, however, on the reaction of Mary's mother. It was with something of a shock that he had learned from Mary's letters of the trouble she was having at home because she had

not been married by a priest. He should have realized, he supposed, that the mother would find out about the marriage. He had not imagined, however, that she would blow up in Mary's face as she had. After all, she might have been expected to think that it was a good thing that her daughter could get free. He had no illusions as to what Mary's family would think of him for getting her in trouble, though he had not really intended to do that to her at the time, and was trying to make amends as best he could. If they hated him he would not exactly blame them, but he had thought they would appreciate the fact that Mary could so easily get rid of him and marry someone else.

It was too bad that Mary had lost the baby. He had been very worried about that. After all, he had felt responsible. If she had died he would never have forgiven himself. He had obtained a furlough and had come home to be with her when she was so ill. At the hospital they would not let him stay very long in her room, because she was so sick. She had seemed pleased to see him, and he had been very glad that he had come.

It was tough to see the poor girl lying there wracked with pain and trying so hard to be brave about it. It was the sort of thing that made a man want to go out and get a good stiff drink as soon as he could. He had done that, and had run into his brother and his wife with a friend of theirs downtown. He had learned later that people said he was running around with women while his wife was sick in the hospital, but that was not true. This he wanted clearly understood. He might be no good in other ways, but he did not believe in cheating on the wife. After all, what harm was there in having a drink with your brother and sister-in-law and a friend of theirs? They had, of course, dropped him off at his home after trying to cheer him up as best they could. He was feeling pretty low after watching what Mary was going through and being unable to do anything for her.

Somehow, seeing Mary so sick there in the hospital had done something to him. He had not cared too much for her before, but the sight of her trying so hard to be brave when she was so ill had hit him. That was why he had been more agreeable when she was well again and wanted to come and see him and have the marriage fixed up by the chaplain on the station. He still did not think that she would be able really to love him, but he did have a more tender feeling for her especially because of the way her

mother had nagged her for not being married by the priest, even when she was just recovering from the illness.

He still did not want to be tied to anyone, but he had come to the conclusion that if it had to be someone Mary was about the best he would ever find. She had been so game about the whole thing. He could not remember any other girl whom he had ever met who had so many good qualities. Thinking it over he did not expect ever to meet anyone better. With this new disposition toward Mary he had taken the instructions for a mixed marriage. They had been married, finally, and they had had a sort of honeymoon, as much as a lot of couples were able to have in wartime, at any rate. Then he had shipped out.

Once at sea he had begun again to think the whole thing over and once again he had come to the conclusion that Mary really should not be tied to him. Furthermore, the matter of his running around with women had come up and she seemed pretty disturbed about that. The more he thought it over the more he realized he was not worthy of such a fine girl. Consequently, he had written to her that she should get a divorce if she wanted it. That would not free her, he knew, for they had by that time been married by a priest, but then, there was always the possibility that the situation would be taken care of by his death. He had not wanted to mention that in so many words, or she might have had more worries. She was so inclined to take things seriously and to worry over them. He had written that the situation might take care of itself on his end of the line, if she did not want to get a divorce.

It was a pity, in a way, that he had not been hit where it would count instead of just getting crippled up. Now Mary was having all the trouble that he had feared she would, and it was on his account, too. He could not force himself on her, she had her divorce by now, and then, too, she should not be burdened with a cripple. Rather than have her feeling sorry for him he had not explained to her about the women he was supposed to have been running around with.

John hoped they would find some way to fix things for Mary. After all, he had not wanted to marry her in the beginning, just like she said. As for the second marriage, while he had been willing to go through with it, and while they had had their little honeymoon, still, the priests must realize that it was really more to protect her from her mother's nagging than for any other reason

that they had gone through with it. She was a nice girl, Mary was, and he hoped that she would get what she wanted. She would make some lucky fellow a very good wife, he was sure.

Since there was no more testimony to be presented in the case the presiding judge by his decree ordered the communication of the proofs in the case to the parties and their attorneys-at-law, so that they could look at the records of the testimony and documents collected in the case to that point, and obtain a copy thereof.[5] A copy of all the proofs adduced up to that time was sent to John Holmes, too. In the same decree the presiding judge set two weeks as the limit within which the parties and the Defender of the Bond were to put in further documents or arguments to strengthen, explain, or complete the proofs which they had presented. Such documents or arguments might also be presented to bolster their attacks on the proofs which were of record.

At the end of the two-week period, when the additional observations of Fr. Brown were presented in support of the testimony already adduced, and when the Defender had pointed out the weaknesses in the testimony presented for the petitioner's side of the case, the presiding judge issued another decree in which he stated that the previous requirements of Article 176 had been met and that the case was sufficiently built up. The Defender of the Bond had been asked, of course, whether he thought there was something more which might usefully be brought in, but he did not feel that anything more needed to be shown for his side of the case.[6]

New proofs could have been brought in, upon proper showing, even after the decree to close the case as being sufficiently built up,[7] but there was nothing more to be added, it seemed, so the presiding judge ordered Fr. Brown to present his brief on the case within ten days' time.

The brief was in writing, signed by the attorney, Fr. Brown, and, on presentation to the presiding judge who signed it at the end, it was ready to be copied. A copy went to each of the judges, to the Defender of the Bond, and to John Holmes.[8]

The presiding judge ordered the Defender to answer the brief

[5] Cf. Art. 175.
[6] Cf. Art. 177.
[7] Cf. Art. 178, § 1.
[8] Cf. Art. 179.

of the petitioner within ten days from the receipt thereof.[9] This time, however, was extended on request of the Defender, who in the meantime had been presented with another case which was about to go to trial. In view of the fact that he had to begin preparations for the defense of the next case, the court allowed him an additional ten days in which to answer the brief of Fr. Brown.[10]

Like any novice, Fr. Brown used the full twenty typewritten pages allowed him for his brief, and in it argued at great length for his side of the case.[11] The Defender, more accustomed to such work, limited himself to five pages in which he pointed out succinctly and without extensive quotations from witnesses to burden the judges—he merely referred to page and line of the record in their hands—the weaknesses in the petitioner's case.

Because of the nature of the testimony in the case and the effect that might result to Mary's reputation as well as to John's if the evidence presented were to go any farther, the presiding judge ordered that the copies of the testimony and of the briefs should not be permitted to come into the hands of outsiders.[12] Thus, since the hearings had all been private and the written record would not be available to anyone who did not already know of the situation there was little danger that the general public would be treated to an exposé of matters which would not be a credit to the parties.

When the Defender's answer was handed in to the court, the presiding judge ordered an oral discussion of the case within ten days.[13] This was for the purpose of giving the court an opportunity to question the attorney and the Defender as to the arguments adduced by them in their briefs. Thus the judges would be able to clarify in their minds the points made in writing, the true sense of which was not always apparent on mere reading.

At the oral discussion Fr. Brown and the Defender of the Bond were each given fifteen minutes in which to present their side of the case briefly, without repeating what was already known, and to answer the questions of the judges.[14] The time actually consumed by Fr. Brown was more than fifteen minutes, for the judges had more questions to ask than could be answered in the time allotted. The men on the bench were not hostile, but they did want

[9] Cf. Art. 180, § 1.
[10] Cf. Art. 181.
[11] Cf. Art. 182.
[12] Cf. Art. 184.
[13] Cf. Art. 186. § 1.
[14] Cf. Art. 186, § 4.

to know what merit he had found in the case he was presenting to them for consideration. The notary was also present to write down whatever the presiding judge might want recorded during the oral discussion.[15] At the conclusion of the discussion the presiding judge announced that the decision in the case would be handed down five days later.[16]

Coming to the sentence which would end the case,[17] the judges went over the record again, in the light of the impressions which they had received during the hearings, to arrive at some certainty whether the answer should be: the nullity of the marriage in question on the grounds of simulated consent is proved, or, it is not proved.[18]

Keeping in mind that marriage enjoys the favor of the law, so that in case of doubt the doubts are to be resolved in favor of the validity of the marriage until the contrary is proved,[19] the judges were careful to avoid, in considering the record, any presumptions which were not logical and immediate conclusions from the record. They sought also to avoid any speculation as to what might have been the intention of the parties, when they did not find it expressed on the record.[20] They had heard the circumstances which preceded, accompanied, and followed the marriage so that they might make such conjectures as would be necessary, as they always are in any case involving defects in consent of the parties,[21] and on these they had to base their decision.

So far as the judges could see, there had been an attempted marriage before a Justice of the Peace which was null and void because of defect of form. They could not, however, see how the alleged simulation of consent had been proved as to the second marriage. After all, the girl had wanted the marriage, and so had the man. It was true that there had been some fear of the mother of the girl which influenced to some extent their desire for this marriage, but the marriage was not being attacked on the grounds of force and fear exercised on the girl. Even so, the fear which she had felt for her mother's anger, if any real fear there was, was not an influence exercised on the will of the man. He had desired the marriage, at least to help the girl out of her difficulties

[15] Cf. Art. 186, § 5.
[16] Cf. Art. 185.
[17] Cf. Art. 196.
[18] Cf. Art. 197, § 1.
[19] Cf. Art. 171.
[20] Cf. Art. 173.
[21] Cf. Art. 174.

at home. Furthermore, he had come to feel a certain attachment for her and to like her courage in bearing the trials of her illness.

It was true that the man had not wanted to be tied down to a wife at the time that he married the girl before the Justice of the Peace, and that that ceremony was chosen by him so that he would be able to get free after the baby was born. Still, in the interval between the first and second marriages he had changed his ideas to the extent that he was willing to enter a marriage from which he knew that the girl could not be released by a subsequent divorce. In fact, when he thought about her being tied to him and considered that perhaps she might not like him for that, he had thought of death in battle as a way out, so he evidently considered that a real bond had been contracted.

No matter how one looked at the case it still remained true that both of the parties had desired the second marriage at the time they entered into it, whether from one motive or from the other. There might have been ideas of subsequent separation, fear that the other party might not want to continue in the marriage bond, but at the time of the marriage, and that was the point at which nullity was asserted, they did want to be married to each other. Try as they might the judges could not escape from this conclusion.

The fourth day after the oral discussion the judges gathered by themselves with no one else present in the court-room to prepare the sentence in the case.[22] Each judge had with him his conclusions in writing as to the result which he had reached on the merits of the case, bolstered with the reasons, from the facts and from the law, which had led him to his conclusion.[23] The presiding judge as *ponens* or *relator* read his opinion first. He was followed by the senior of the two pro-synodal judges and then by the junior. They then discussed their conclusions and the reasons therefor, with the presiding judge leading the discussion.[24] In the course of this discussion there appeared complete unanimity of opinions, so there was no need for a change of any judge's previous position.[25] As a result the *ponens* or *relator* was able to put down the decision at once, *Non constat,* and add it with the written opinions of himself and

[22] Cf. Art. 198, § 1.
[23] Cf. Art. 198, § 2.
[24] Cf. Art. 198, § 3.
[25] Cf. Art. 198, § 4.

the other judges[26] to the acts of the case, with the signatures of all three judges.[27]

When the judges came out of the chamber where they had held their discussion they informed the notary of their decision. The latter then notified Fr. Brown, as attorney-in-fact for Mary Carson Holmes, that the decision had been unfavorable. Fr. Brown wanted to appeal immediately, and so advised Mary. The time for the appeal did not, however, begin to run from the time of his notification by the notary. The formal announcement of the sentence was not to be made until the following day, and from that date the time for appeal would run.[28]

The following day, therefore, Mary Carson Holmes, Fr. Brown, and the Defender of the Bond, were all present in the court-room to hear the reading of the sentence. This was in Latin (an English translation was subsequently read for Mary's benefit), and contained not only the decision *Non constat,* but also the reasons for it, which the *ponens* or *relator* had been able to put together quite simply by using the written opinions which the judges had brought with them to their discussion of the sentence to be given in the case. The other judges had left it to him to do this, there being no particular reason for them to specify that he should use one or the other of the reasons to the exclusion of the rest. Before they filed into the court-room for the reading of the sentence[29] the judges all looked over the decision as written by the *ponens* to approve it and sign it.[30]

Like any other sentence of an ecclesiastical tribunal this one[31] began with the invocation of the Divine Name, and then stated that the Tribunal of the Diocese of ———— in the case of Mary Carson Holmes, petitioner against John Holmes, respondent, the said petitioner being represented by the Rev. John Brown, as her attorney-at-law and-in-fact, she residing at ——— Street, in the City of ———, and Fr. Brown residing at ——— Street in the City of ———, and the said John Holmes residing at ——— Hospital, in the City of ———, the Defender of the Bond being the Rev. Charles Luckman, had decided the following:

(A) *In facto:*

(1) The said Mary Carson Holmes was found to have con-

[26] Cf. Art. 198, § 2.
[27] Cf. Art. 198, § 6.
[28] Cf. Art. 199.
[29] Cf. Art. 204.
[30] Cf. Art. 200.
[31] Cf. Art. 202.

tracted marriage with the said John Holmes on the fourteenth day of December, 1941, in the presence of the Rev. James Callahan, Chaplain USNR, a priest, at ———, and in the presence of two witnesses, according to the Catholic form of marriage to which the petitioner was bound.

(2) There had been no conditions attached to this marriage.

(3) There had been no indication that either party was merely simulating consent at the time that they pronounced the formula of marriage, but rather that when they uttered the words they meant what they said, though possibly each may have had a different reason for going through the ceremony.

(4) There were no sufficient presumptions that the man had, as alleged, not intended really to consent to marriage to the girl.

(B) *In iure:*

There is a presumption of law that when a ceremony of marriage has been performed it has been rightly performed (Can. 1014, Art. 171), and that therefore the marriage is valid.

The facts as extended on the record showed that there had been a marriage contracted because both parties wanted to contract that particular marriage with each other, though for various reasons. A marriage once contracted enjoys the favor of the law, therefore, the judges had decided that the sentence in this case, answering the question raised at the joinder of issue, namely, whether it was proved that the marriage in question was null and void from the beginning on the grounds of simulated consent on the part of John Holmes, should be *Non constat.*

At the end of the sentence there were the usual indications of the date and place in which the sentence was given, together with the signatures of the judges and of the notary, and the seal of the court.[32]

The sentence represented the final decision of the tribunal as a whole. The opinions which the judges had written up and taken with them into the discussion within the tribunal were filed in the secret archives of the curia, there to remain for ten years. The various opinions which might appear were not, after all, the final conclusions of the court, but merely the personal opinions of the judges prior to the final vote on the case, so they could not be grounds for attack on the sentence or for reversal of the decision.[33]

[32] Cf. Art. 202.

[33] Cf. Art. 203.

The judges, further, well understood that they were not to talk outside the conference room about the discussion of the case, and about how the various members of the tribunal had felt with regard to the sentence. The sentence was a collegiate act, and the ideas of individuals composing the college were of no importance, as such.[34]

When the reading was finished the judges had lost all control of the sentence, so that even were they unanimous in desiring to reverse themselves they had no more power to do so.[35] There was no material error to be found in the text or in the transcription of the dispositive part, or in the report of any fact, so there was no reason for correcting it in that regard.[36]

Fr. Brown, acting on the authority of Mary Carson Holmes, who was present, interposed an appeal to the court of the metropolitan as soon as the presiding judge had finished reading the sentence. The appeal was taken because he and his client felt that the decision was prejudicial to her rights.[37] He would have had ten days in which to make such an appeal, but since all those interested, with the exception of John Holmes, were then present in the courtroom, he made it immediately.[38] This meant, of course, that the time for prosecuting the appeal, one month, began to run from that day.[39]

(To be Continued)

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

[34] Cf. Art. 203, § 2.
[35] Cf. Art. 205, § 1.
[36] Cf. Art. 205, § 2.
[37] Cf. Art. 212, § 1.
[38] Cf. Art. 215, § 1.
[39] Cf. Art. 215, § 1.

SANCTITY AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Would the complete definition of Catholic holiness be given in saying: It is the Gospel of Jesus Christ lived as nearly as possible? No; to complete the definition it is necessary to add: Under the aegis of the requisite authority of the Church.

—Fr. Raoul Plus S.J., in *The Holiness in the Church* (London and Edinburgh: Sands and Company; St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1929), p. 14.

THE SOURCES OF MODERN ATTACKS AGAINST THE CHURCH

During the past couple of years the American press has reported an unusually large number of attacks and charges against the Catholic Church. Taken individually, a great many of these charges are not serious enough to warrant any particular attention. Far too frequently they manifest themselves as mere bids for publicity put forward by individuals who would apparently find tremendous difficulty in doing any work more exigent intellectually than that of shouting against the true Church of Jesus Christ. Often too these contemporary accusations against the Church turn out to be nothing more important than routine handouts from the faceless men of Moscow.

Considered collectively, however, the various contemporary charges against the Catholic Church are extremely important. They form the center of a mass of propaganda calculated to turn people away from Our Lord and from His Church. Any man who is aware of the fact that it is God's will that all men should be saved through Our Lord in the Church is bound by charity to do whatever he can towards pointing out the fallacious character of these onslaughts against the true Church. The obligation of indicating the errors contained in contemporary charges against the Catholic Church naturally enough rests primarily upon the Catholic priest. Hence an understanding of the best way to deal with such attacks against the Church forms an integral part of what we may call the necessary professional knowledge of the contemporary priest.

CATHOLICS AND GROUP-SOLIDARITY

Strange to say there can be found an occasional Catholic, and sometimes even an occasional priest, who will disapprove of efforts on the part of Catholics to answer and to challenge published attacks upon the Church. For some reason or other such procedure is supposed to indicate the presence of an undesirable and intense group-consciousness among Catholics. It is extremely difficult to see how any educated Catholic could bring himself to imagine that a highly developed group-consciousness could be other than absolutely requisite in the Church of Jesus Christ.

The love of His disciples, that is of the members of the Catholic Church, *for one another* is supposed, according to Our Blessed Lord Himself, to be clear and obvious enough to serve to identify these disciples for what they are. It was to the disciples that Our Lord spoke these words.

A new commandment I give unto you: That you love one another, as I have loved you, that you also love one another.

By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another.[1]

Again the unity (or the group-solidarity) of the disciples was, according to the prayer of Our Lord Himself, to be strong and striking enough to serve as a motive of credibility for the world.

And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me.

That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.

And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given to them: that they may be one, as we also are one.

I in them, and thou in me: that they may be made perfect in one: and the world may know that thou hast sent me and hast loved them, as thou also hast loved me.[2]

The most fatal mistake which Catholics can make in dealing with the teachings and the commands of Christ is to take His words as other than sincere and meaningful. Those who protest (always to the delight of those outside the fold) against group-consciousness and group-solidarity within the Church of God, and who frown upon that love and enthusiasm for the Church which result in answers to charges made against it, would seem to have fallen into this error. They seem not to realize that the Catholic Church is *truly* the house or the family of God, and that a special affection for the society itself and for the members of the society is incumbent upon every person who is privileged to dwell within that house. If a man takes Our Lord's teachings about the Catholic Church seriously, it will be absolutely impossible for him not to have a vigorous and manifest family loyalty to this society and to its members.

[1] *John* 13: 34-35. [2] *John* 17: 20-23.

SINCERITY AND POLEMIC

The men who wring their hands over what they regard as the aggressiveness of contemporary Catholic polemics seem to imply that sincerity on the part of one of the Church's opponents should automatically forbid any response to that opponent which might possibly hurt his feelings. Such an attitude stems from the wildest sort of confusion. Ordinarily, at any rate, Catholic polemics is in no way concerned with sincerity or the lack of it on the part of the opponent of the Church. The enemy of the Church may be said to be sincere in the event that he actually believes as true the charges which he brings against the Catholic Church. The answer to those erroneous charges, bringing enlightenment on the particular point on which he has deviated from truth, is just as much a favor to the enemy of the Church as it is to anyone else. Writing in 1520, James Latomus described his and his University's attitude towards Martin Luther, and thus gave quite clearly the ideal attitude of distinction between a man and his work in the business of controversy. He is discussing the Louvain condemnation of Luther's writings.

> That he [Martin Luther] is said to be a good man is of no concern to us at all. We have not said that he is an evil man. But, whatever sort of man he may be, it is evident that he has written things which are not good. We have not condemned him, but his errors. It was useless to warn him privately when his books, scattered over the world, made it clear that he would pay no attention to a warning.[3]

It is always amusing to read a liberal Catholic's protest against what he regards as a too forceful presentation of the Catholic case against the Church's detractors in our own times. Generally such protest carries with it an appeal to return to the "gentle" apologetic of the New Testament and of the primitive Christian writers. Patently such a notion would never occur to a man who was at all familiar with the bitter denunciation of the scribes and of the pharisees recorded in the Gospels or with the uncompromising firmness of the Epistle to the Galatians and of the Apocalypse. St. Justin Martyr, sometimes held up as an example for gentleness in Catholic polemic, taught that Marcion's effectiveness as a

[3] The *Epistola dedicatoria* to the work *Contra articulos quosdam Martini Lutheri a Theologis Lovaniensibus damnatos*, in the *Opera omnia* (Louvain, 1579), p. 1r.

propagandist was to be attributed to devils.[4] In any event, if there is one defect from which the Catholic Church does not suffer today, it is an over-aggressive attitude on the part of its literary defenders. A warning against such an attitude will most certainly do no good to the Church, even though it has the effect of endearing the man who makes it to the enemies of the Church.

If we are to deal at all effectively with the present-day crop of attacks against the Church, it is imperative that we should know and appreciate not only the actual charges and assertions made by the Church's enemies, but also the background or the source behind the individual attack. When a man claims that the Church or the hierarchy is seeking too much power, it is impossible to offer a reasonable response to this claim until we see the particular error which has inspired this assertion. Important attacks in this direction are made against the Church in our own time by Communists, by Protestants, by Anglicans, by members of dissident oriental groups, by those called Jehovah's Witnesses, and by persons who claim no affiliation other than that of liberalism. In every case, however, the motive for the charge is somewhat different, and an effective answer to the allegation will demand a knowledge of that motive.

THE COMMUNIST POSITION

The fact and the articulateness of the Communist attack against the Catholic Church are too well known to require comment. It is a rare week when the columns of the *New York Times* do not recount some fresh denunciation of the Church on the part of some Moscow journal or speaker. Furthermore the suppression of the Church in Russia, as well as the persecution of Catholics in those countries which have fallen under Bolshevist domination since the war shows that Communist opposition to Catholicism is not something merely academic in character. The reasons why Communists are unalterably opposed to the true Church of Jesus Christ are found in both the theory and the practice of Communism.

In the *Divini Redemptoris* Pope Pius XI delivered, once and for all, the devastating exposé of the communistic theory. He found it a system of materialistic and hopeless tyranny, concealed under the false messianic ideal of justice, of equality, and of fraternity

[4] Cf. *First Apology*, cap. 26.

in labor. He indicated the cynical promise of a classless society which the communistic leaders held out to their dupes. Since the very philosophy upon which the theory of Communism is constructed is itself based upon the denial of God, Pope Pius XI showed how the communistic society is naturally and as it were instinctively hostile to the Catholic Church, the one organization on earth which is visibly, effectively, and enthusiastically devoted to the worship of the one true God.

The actually existing Communist state, however, throws far more light than any mere Marxian theory on the reason why the Communists are so bitterly hostile to the Catholic Church. Russia, the actual Communist Empire, is a nation of slaves, dominated by a Communist Czar and held in check by a swarm of spies. As far as the Communists are concerned, the only satisfactory subject is a man who thinks like a slave. For that reason, the Catholic Church, which possesses and which dispenses the high freedom which comes from the truth of God, can never be other than eminently unsatisfactory to the Communists.

For the achievement of its object, the Communist party relies on vigorous persecution where it is able to do so, and upon a no less vigorous rhetoric elsewhere. We would look in vain in communistic literature for anything like a series of logical objections to the Catholic position. The Communists know themselves, their ideals, and their limitations far too well to attempt anything of the sort. They set out to use words, not to bring knowledge, but to establish attitudes. They parade their catch-phrases in order, if possible, to weaken the loyalty of Catholics for their Church and for the leaders of that Church, and to make the Church appear unpleasant to those outside the fold.

To deal successfully with the objections made against the Church from Communist sources, we must point out the real meaning of the theory which underlies the Communist mentality. Then, with all the resources at our command, we must bring men to look and see what Communism has actually done. If those who are troubled by charges against the Church emanating from Communist circles can be brought to realize the truth that the Church is being attacked precisely because it stands in the way of a campaign which actually tends towards the enslavement and the degradation of mankind, then a good start will have been made in the direction of answering Communist propaganda.

Still, manifesting the evils of Communism is only one section of our work for Catholic truth. The main part of this task consists in bringing out the fact that the benefits which the Communists, either gullibly or cynically, as the case may be, claim that their system will give to the human race, are to be found in reality, in an ineffably higher degree, in the message of God preached infallibly by the Catholic Church. This, and this alone, is the truth which makes men free.

THE PROTESTANT POSITION

The Communist attacks the Catholic Church because this society definitely stands in the way of the sort of all-out obedience to Mr. Stalin which the Communist properly regards as essential to his purpose. The Protestant, on the other hand, is hostile to the Church because it seems to go beyond what he considers necessary for adherence to Our Lord. The statements of those solemn gentlemen who spend so much of their time in parading up the steps to the dwelling at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. in order to demand the recall of Mr. Myron Taylor from Vatican City are, in a way, perfectly consistent with the essential Protestant religious position. So are the somewhat hysterical articles which so frequently adorn the pages of the *Christian Century*. The absolute falsity of their demands and their statements can only be appreciated in the light of their basic attitudes.

The specifically Protestant opposition to the true Church of Jesus Christ stems from a mistaken notion about the nature of Christianity. Like the Catholic, the Protestant wills to be a follower, a disciple, of Our Lord. The very basis, however, of Protestantism as such is to be found in its teaching about the way in which this attachment to Our Lord is to be achieved. The one common element in the teaching of the Lutherans and of the Calvinists which has been accepted without question by all of their various followers (and which, incidentally, has served to confuse certain untheological Catholic writers as well) is the illusion that a man becomes in the primary and proper sense of the term a follower or a disciple of Christ, a Christian, through the possession of some internal quality, an interest in or sympathy with Our Lord. The original Protestant groups insisted that this quality be either the possession of the state of grace or of what we might call the charism of predestination. Their later followers

seem, at any rate, to attach the name of Christian to any person who wishes, in some way or another, to follow the example or to accept the teaching of Christ.

In the theory of Protestantism membership in a religious society is definitely and necessarily a secondary concern. Thus for the Protestant, or for the man with a Protestant mentality, the word "Christian" becomes a term something like "philatelist." A man is classified as a stamp collector by the fact that he is interested in this avocation and works at it. Membership in any one of the numerous organizations devoted to the pursuance of philately is in no wise requisite, even though it be desirable.

On the other hand, the Catholic truth on this matter is that the word "Christian" is one which primarily designates a member of an organization. Thus "Christian" is a word analogous to "soldier" rather than to "stamp collector." A man is designated as a soldier, not by the fact that he is interested in military maneuvers, nor by reason of his sympathy with the objectives and the methods of some particular army. He is a soldier only if he is enrolled in a definite organization, a part of a definite army. In exactly the same way the Acts of the Apostles and the other books of the New Testament, as well as the constant tradition of authentic and orthodox Christian writing, show us that a man is properly a Christian only when he is enrolled as a member of that organized society into which Our Lord formed His disciples.

In the time intervening between Our Lord's ascension into heaven and the first Christian Pentecost there were no disciples or followers of Christ other than those who were gathered around the apostles and placed under the command of St. Peter. When the three thousand accepted St. Peter's teaching on that Pentecost and wished to become followers of Christ, they had no recourse other than to be baptized and enrolled as fellow members with the original disciples in that society into which the original disciples had already been organized. Only thus were they saved from "this perverse generation" and brought into the company of Christ.[5] The members of this society and only these members were designated as Christians in the city of Antioch.[6] Only such members have a proper right to that designation today.

[5] Cf. *Acts* 2:40.

[6] Cf. *Acts* 11:26.

This is the point from which any effective answer to typically Protestant charges against the Catholic Church must proceed. When Protestant religious leaders attack the Church for seeking too much power, they merely act on the mistaken supposition that the true and visible Church of Jesus Christ should operate according to the schedule drawn up for their type of religious association. Their bigotry proceeds from ignorance, but from ignorance chiefly of the one essential point that association with Christ is only to be achieved, according to His divine will, in the organized society within which He dwells and over which He presides.

THE LIBERAL APPROACH

The "Liberal" religious position with reference to the Catholic Church is a development of the Protestant approach. Where the Protestant imagines that association with Our Lord is to be achieved primarily and essentially by means of some sympathy with or interest in Him, and thus believes that all religious societies nominally devoted to Christ are objectively entitled to be considered on the same footing, the "Liberal" theoretically accords the same recognition to any kind of religious organization whatsoever. Where the Protestant wishes to be a follower of Christ, the "Liberal" simply wants to be religious. Likewise, then, where the Protestant is prone to object against the Catholic Church because it claims to be *the* Christian religious society, the "Liberal" is prepared to assail it because it professes to be *the* society necessary for the salvation of men, teaching God's message infallibly and authoritatively. It is the claim of truth itself, the assertion of the fact that the Church is the one necessary and infallible religious society, which makes the Church anathema to the "Liberal."

The "Liberal" dislike of any claim that a religious organization possesses unique divine authority is well conveyed in the now famous words of Mr. Clyde Miller in his "Introduction" to *The Story of the Springfield Plan.* He is speaking of the four "delusions" which are to be eliminated by the Plan.

> The first is the delusion that one's own church, cult, sect, or group alone expresses God's will on earth, that it alone can reveal God's purposes toward mankind. We have seen this delusion in the Shintoism

of Japan, in Emperor worship. The Emperor is divine, and treason against the nation is blasphemy against God. But this delusion has not been confined to the Japanese.[7]

In a letter published in *America* Mr. Miller insisted that he did not have the Catholic Church in mind when he was writing these lines.[8] He was thinking, he said, of the attitudes of some of his non-Catholic co-religionists, and he saw in the "delusion" he had described the basis of all bigotry.

To be true to this "Liberal" attitude, a man cannot even face the possibility that there might be one society commissioned and guided by God Himself to deliver His message to mankind. He must not distinguish between the status of the Protestant, who, in making the claim of a unique mission from God and of necessity for his own religious society, is obviously going beyond the teaching of his society itself, and the status of the Catholic who, in asserting that his Church is the one authentic, infallible, and necessary Church of God, is merely stating the dogma of his Church and is stating a fact. Such a "Liberal" remains what he is only through the vigorous exercise of keeping his eyes firmly closed against the evidence of truth.

The "Liberal" attitude towards the Catholic Church is nowhere better revealed than in a document issued previous to the American entry into the recent war, and signed by seventeen of the most authentic "Liberals."

No apologetic is needed for the greatness of the Roman Church or for the glory of its achievements in piloting Western man through the Dark Ages. But its catholicity was severely curtailed by its constant temptation to commit the basic error of identifying the Church as a temporal kingdom with the "Kingdom of God" of Christian and prophetic expectation. This error invests the sociologically relative architecture of the Church with an unwarranted aura of unqualified holiness. An ecclesiastical institution buffeted by the vicissitudes of the centuries, conditioned by the mutation of social and political forces, subject to the corruptions which assail all institutions, claims an absoluteness of

---

[7] *The Story of the Springfield Plan*, by Clarence I. Chatto and Alice L. Halligan (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1945), p. xv. The passage cited is from Mr. Miller's Introduction. An excellent Catholic appreciation of this passage and of the book as a whole will be found in Dr. Edmond Darvil Benard's "The 'Meaning' of the Springfield Plan," in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXIV, 1 (Jan. 1946), pp. 1-12.

[8] Cf. *America*, LXXV, 2 (Apr. 13, 1946), p. 39.

veneration which is incompatible with its relativity in history. The historical usurps the sanctity of the eternal.[9]

Blithely oblivious of the fact that it was Our Lord Himself who spoke in the same terms of His Church and of the Kingdom of Heaven,[10] and of the central mystery of the Church, which consists in the fact that an historical and organized society in which good and bad members will be mingled together until the end of time really is the society in which alone man finds the fellowship of Christ, the embattled signers proceed to more of the same. The Church is warned that "its *Syllabus of Errors* (1864), the start of a Second Counter-Reformation challenging the liberal world that had risen from Reformation and Renaissance, played into the hands of political and social obscurantism."[11] Finally, all qualified Catholics are summoned to the sacred duties of laicism. The Holy Father must not, according to *The City of Man*, speak out and expect to be followed in any matter where politics are concerned.

Freedom-loving, justice-loving Catholics—here as well as in the Latin-American republics and wherever else they can reawaken to the examples bequeathed by braver ages—will see to it some day that humility in faith be no longer the lure to servility in politics and that allegiance to the City of God be disentangled again from bondage to Vatican City as a foreign potentate in feud or trade with other potentates.[12]

The City of Man is particularly valuable for a study of the "Liberal" attitude towards and hostility against the Catholic Church because, unlike other documents emanating from similar sources, it proceeds to the logical implications of the "Liberal" position. Men like Messrs. Van Wyck Brooks, Hans Kohn, and Reinhold Niebuhr (to mention only the best known among the signers of *The City of Man*), are almost hysterically angry with the Church for claiming "an absoluteness of veneration." *The City of Man* informs us that these "Liberals" have a kind of religion for which they claim the same thing. This is "the religion of the Spirit, to which all men are witnesses,"[13] "the common

[9] *The City of Man. A Declaration on World Democracy* (New York: The Viking Press, 1941), pp. 40 f.

[10] Cf. *Matt.* 16: 18-19.

[11] *The City of Man*, p. 41.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

belief of man."[14] It would seem that "The latter [the common belief of man] explains and annexes all dogmas as symbols; the churches, in the fetters of literalism, anathematize as heresy and error the symbolical meaning that is the dogma's inmost truth."[15] It is "the common creed, which embraces and interprets every lesser faith."[16]

The new supreme Religion of the Seventeen is already existent and ready to take over.

> This common creed already exists; toward its luminous center all higher minds [those of the signers of course] already point, from whatever distant horizon they may set out. The yoke of this creed is as easy as it is inevitable; its doctrines are as plain as they are undebatable. It teaches that a divine intention governs the universe—be it called God or Deity or the Holy Ghost or the Absolute or Logos or even Evolution.[17]

To sustain their attitudes towards the Church's claims of necessity and infallibility, "Liberals" have recourse to such bizarre accounts of the origin of Christianity as that contained in Lewis Browne's *This Believing World*. That Our Lord had been captured by the Jews while He was trying to escape from them,[18] that the disciples only imagined that He had risen from the dead,[19] that they "even declared that they had actually seen him in the act of rising from the sepulcher,"[20] that they had invented the genealogies and "those extravagant legends concerning the conception, birth, childhood, and ministry of Jesus,"[21] that St. Paul was the real founder of Christianity,[22] all of these patent historical absurdities are treated reverently and received as learning in order that the Church may be depicted in the guise in which the "Liberals" wish to see it.

The only really effective way to handle the charges which are made against the Church by those of the "Liberal" camp is to

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 45.
[15] *Ibid.*
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 46.
[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 46 f.
[18] Cf. *This Believing World* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941), p. 270.
[19] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 273.
[20] *Ibid.*
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 276.
[22] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 283.

insist upon an examination of the most fundamental religious truths, those which are set forth in the science of Christian apologetics. This course, it must be admitted, is not particularly easy. The "Liberal" has a way of shying away from hard facts. He may, for instance, speak about the study of religion as something like an effort "To gain an understanding of the need for religion in the life of ancient man and in succeeding groups as an attempt to account for things which men could not understand, and as an attempt to get harmonious living conditions."[23] In dealing with a man who works on this assumption, it is the duty of the Catholic teacher to bring out the fact that the Catholic religion is nothing of the sort. It is most certainly not an attempt to account for phenomena which men did not understand prior to modern research in electricity and in medicine. Most certainly it is not a mere attempt to gain better and more harmonious living conditions. What it is, and what it claims to be, is the worship of the one true God, according to the directions which He has given to us through His divine Son. On that standard, and on that alone, can the Catholic religion be intelligently discussed.

THE POSITION OF THE EASTERN DISSIDENTS AND OF THE ANGLICANS

In dealing with the objections and charges raised against the true Church by members of the dissident oriental communions, we must distinguish sharply between the theory of these groups and their actual procedure. In theory their position towards the Catholic Church is very much like that of the High Church Anglicans. In practice, at the hands of men like the Patriarch Alexei, their opposition is simply that of the Communist party line. The unfortunates who chose to gather around the Sacred Emperor rather than around the Vicar of Christ have found that the Emperor is now no less a personage than Comrade Stalin.

The basic High Church Anglican (and incidentally the theoretical Eastern Orthodox) position with reference to the Church is something quite different from that of any of those groups we have mentioned previously. Like the Protestants and the Cath-

[23] This is the first of the "specific objectives" in the Springfield Plan's study outline for the eighth grade course, *Democratic Procedures. The Contributions of Religions to Present Democratic Procedures.* It is found on page 2 of the mimeographed outline. It is interesting to note that Browne's *This Believing World* is listed (p. 16) in the bibliography for teachers presenting this course.

olics, the Anglicans profess themselves as desirous of being in the fellowship of Christ. Like the Catholics, and unlike the Protestants, the High Church Anglicans hold that this fellowship is to be found within the visible society founded by Our Lord. The authoritative *Doctrine in the Church of England* speaks of "The life of the Church as visible and militant here in earth."[24] The brilliant Oxonian scholar, Professor Cuthbert Hamilton Turner, wrote that "We stand, in the first place, on the idea of a Church, a visible Church, a Catholic Church: and there is only one Catholic Church conceivable, the Church which has been from the beginning."[25] Dr. H. Burn-Murdoch of Cambridge teaches that "The new Ekklesia of the Lord, thus rebuilt upon the old Ekklesia of Israel, is to be a society recognizable in the world both collectively and individually."[26]

The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger of the General Theological Seminary in New York has given a most explicit American statement of the Anglican position.

> "No Christian who is not also a member of the church . . ." In that brief phrase, the witness of the New Testament—and, in fact, the testimony of early Christianity as a whole—may be summed up. With most varying phrasing, and likewise with widely differing emphases, the New Testament makes it clear that the way in which one became a Christian believer, in primitive times, and hence a participant in the Christian life, was by becoming a member of the Christian society.[27]

The institution which can produce men who write so accurately about the visible nature of the Church of Christ in this world differs from the true Church basically by reason of its unwillingness to acknowledge the Holy Father's primacy of jurisdiction within the Church of God and his doctrinal infallibility. The objections of this group, unlike those of the "Liberals," are set forth against a background of genuine and serious scholarship. In their most perfect expression, these objections are presented in Dr. Jalland's famous book, *The Church and the Papacy.*

[24] *Doctrine in the Church of England. The Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1938), p. 104.

[25] *Catholic and Apostolic* (London and Oxford: A. R. Mowbray and Co.; Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1931), p. 111.

[26] *Church, Continuity and Unity* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1945), p. 22.

[27] *His Body the Church* (New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1945), p. 1.

Dr. Jalland and the cause which he represents are not afraid of the evidence. They bring out and examine the documents and the pronouncements which are most pertinent to the theses on which they differ from the Catholic Church. The service which we can do for Our Lord in their regard is to master that evidence and to indicate the theological elements which they have not considered sufficiently in bringing in their decision.

They begin with the absolutely correct notion of a glorious Church, a visible society of the disciples of Christ which is to act and to live as His Body in the world. They acknowledge the almost innumerable occasions upon which the Roman Pontiff has *de facto* claimed and exercised supreme jurisdiction within the Church and given *de facto* doctrinal decisions from which there was no appeal. They acknowledge the supremacy of Peter among the apostles, and know that the Bishop of Rome is his successor. The objections which they offer will lose their force once they are brought to understand that the Church cannot really be what they claim it is unless the successor of Peter be actually endowed with the full primacy of jurisdiction and with true doctrinal infallibility.

A visible Church without a true visible ruler could not possibly be the *one* Body of Christ. A doctrinal Church without an infallible and visible head could not be infallible, and could not be the society within which Our Lord resides.

THE ATTACKS FROM JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES

The attacks made against the Catholic Church by the members of this particular organization make up in ardor what they lack in coherence. Nevertheless, it is important to know what their basic stand towards the Church really is.

The Witnesses, like the Catholics themselves, and like the High Church Anglicans, are firm believers in a visible society of Christians. They conceive themselves to be the true Church, and they have appropriated from some source or other a certain amount of genuine Christian doctrine to explain their stand.

They hold that the true Church, the *Theocracy*, is in opposition to the world, presided over by the prince of this world, Satan.[28]

[28] A recent discussion of this phase of the Jehovah's Witness doctrine will be found in the article "The 'World' Concept among Jehovah's Witnesses," by Theodore W. Sprague in *The Harvard Theological Review*, XXXIX, 2 (April, 1946), pp. 109 ff.

In this, of course, they are perfectly correct. Their mistake consists in believing that their society is empowered to speak in the name of God. The act of speaking without authorization in the name of God is the crime of the false prophet. That offense is doubled when the false prophet presumes to denounce what is the true City of God. The priest who is called upon to deal with these people can remind them that the status which they imagine themselves to possess would actually be theirs in the genuine City of God which is the Catholic Church.

CONCLUSION

The people who make these attacks against the Church and those who are victimized by these attacks stand in terrible and obvious need of that divine truth which only the Church can give. The outstanding apostolic work in our country and in our day must inevitably be the effort on the part of our priests to present that divine teaching with perfect accuracy, precisely as it is conserved and taught in the infallible magisterium of the Catholic Church, and yet clearly and effectively, in the language of our own people, so that all may be in a position to recognize its truth, its beauty, and its desirability.

This apostolic and theological work is necessarily a corporate affair. No individual man, however brilliant, will manage it successfully. The American priests must work together, generously acknowledging and using each other's contributions in the direction of a more effective presentation of Christian doctrine and building upon these contributions. The recent formation of the Catholic Theological Society of America has made it perfectly clear that the need for such co-operation in the teaching of Catholic truth is generally recognized. If we are to accomplish the apostolic work God has given us to do, we must follow the injunction St. Paul laid upon our predecessors, that we "stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, laboring together for the faith of the gospel."[29]

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[29] *Phil.* 1:27.

Answers to Questions

THE "RELIGIOUS BOOK LIST" AGAIN

Question: A "religious book list" has recently been published by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. What should be the attitude of Catholics toward such a list, and what would be its practical use as far as Catholics are concerned?

Answer: The subject of the "religious book list" issued by the Conference of Christians and Jews was discussed at some length in a previous issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* (CXIII, 5 [Nov. 1945], 385 ff.). Since that time a new list has appeared, containing the names of some more recent publications. As was stated before, the impression naturally given when three classes of books—Protestant, Catholic and Jewish—are listed in a single pamphlet is that it is quite commendable for the adherents of each of these three denominational groups to read the books which explain and defend the religious beliefs of the other two. Now, this would be strictly forbidden to Catholics as far as a considerable number of books on the Jewish and Protestant lists are concerned (apart from special permission). Hence it is difficult to see what advantage to Catholics there is in a catalogue of Jewish and Protestant publications. On the contrary, such a list might be an incentive to violate the rules which the Catholic Church, in her capacity of defender of the Christian faith, has wisely laid down for the spiritual protection of her children.

Worthy of note in this more recent list, among the so-called "goodwill books," is a work entitled *Garibaldi, Knight of Liberty,* by Jean Burton. A note tells us that it is intended for children between the ages of twelve and sixteen. The Foreword of the pamphlet states that the "goodwill books" were chosen by a Protestant, Catholic and Jewish Committee and are recommended to all. Now, in the biography of Garibaldi we read the statement that throughout Italy (including the Papal States) in the early part of the nineteenth century there was not the "slightest trace of freedom of speech, press, religion or assembly. . . . Nine out of ten of the people could neither read nor write. Food was scarce and dear, and the rulers ground the last cent of taxes from the starving people" (p. 6). The work also states that "Pope Gregory

XVI had been so hated by his subjects that they used to say they would be better off under the Turks" (p. 52); and the papal secretary of state under Pius IX is "the most feared and hated Cardinal Antonelli" (p. 196). Of course, Garibaldi is idealized as a most noble and admirable character, and we are told that, although he was a freethinker, he fostered a kind of mysticism inasmuch as he believed that all things—plants and flowers, as well as man—are part of the soul of the universe, part of the infinite, part of God. And this is the type of book which is intended to be read by Catholic children as a means of promoting good will! No explanation is given as to how a vicious attack on the Popes or the idealizing of pantheism are calculated to arouse good will.

Another "goodwill book"—this one for adults—is *The Story of the Springfield Plan,* by Clarence I. Chatto and Alice L. Halligan. A detailed criticism of this work, by the Rev. Edmond D. Benard, S.T.D., appeared in *The American Ecclesiatical Review* for January, 1946. For our purpose it suffices to quote a sentence from the Introduction by Dr. Clyde R. Miller of Columbia Teachers College. Speaking of various delusions, which can give rise to prejudices, Dr. Miller says: "The first is the delusion that one's own church, cult, sect, or group alone expresses God's will on earth, that it alone can reveal God's purposes toward mankind" (p. xv). If this is a delusion, then Catholics are certainly a deluded group, for they believe that their Church alone expresses God's will on earth. Are we to conclude that this book, advocated by a Committee (with a Catholic member) for *all* persons, is intended to foster good will by urging Catholics to reject the fundamental doctrine of their faith that the Catholic Church alone is the true Church of Jesus Christ?

Why is it that some of our American Catholics are making so many concessions in an effort to win the favor of those who are outside the pale of divine truth? Why the hesitancy to say honestly to those who differ from us in religious matters: "We hold that you are in error; we cannot put our religion on a parity with yours, we cannot give the impression that you have the same right before God to profess your creed that we have to profess the truths of Catholic faith." We must expect to be condemned as narrow-minded by the majority of our fellow-Americans if we proclaim our Catholic belief honestly and unequivocally. Christ never promised that his followers would be popular in the eyes of the world

or would be acclaimed by their fellow-men as broad-minded, liberal, tolerant individuals. He did predict that they would be hated and persecuted. It would be interesting to see the outcome if all those Catholics who are now striving so anxiously to promote good will among the members of all denominations would explicitly tell their non-Catholic friends that they should look to withdrawing from that state in which they cannot be sure of their salvation. That is the message of Pope Pius XII to non-Catholics in the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis.*

ANESTHESIA OF A DYING PERSON

Question: If a nurse is commanded by a doctor to give a dying person a drug or hypodermic injection that will render him unconscious up to the moment of death, is she permitted to obey the order?

Answer: If the dying person has not been informed of the seriousness of his condition and is (probably or certainly) unprepared for death, it is a very grave sin to render him unconscious with the provision that he will die in that state, until he has been warned that the end of life is approaching and given an opportunity to set his soul in order. This principle holds even in the event that the patient is suffering intense physical pain and is craving for relief in the form of an anesthetic. For, in such a case, all other considerations must yield to the all-important duty of urging the dying person to prepare for his entrance into eternity. In a case of this kind, therefore, a nurse would not be allowed to administer a drug or hypodermic injection with the realization that the patient will probably not recover consciousness before death. She must refuse the doctor's orders, or at least let the dying person know of his condition and let him have some time to prepare for death before she gives the anesthetic.

If, however, it is morally certain that the sufferer is sufficiently prepared for death—which, in the case of a Catholic, means that he has received the sacraments—the nurse could lawfully give the prescribed treatment, at least in certain circumstances. Some authors would allow this only in the supposition that the patient is in great pain. For, they say, the last moments of life are so precious from the spiritual standpoint, affording opportunities for fervent acts of contrition, love and resignation, that the deliberate inducing of a state of unconsciousness can be permitted only when there is

an adequate compensating reason, such as relief from excruciating pain. Others allow the administration of a stupifying drug also in the event that the sick person is likely to fall into impatience or despair and thus lose the state of grace; while others add that if the patient asks for drugs in good faith, and there is no hope of setting him right, they may be given him. But all this presupposes that sufficient warning of his approaching death has been given him, as well as an opportunity to prepare his soul for eternity.

It might be asked if the nurse could administer a drug calculated to deprive the dying person of the use of reason if he has been told of his condition and yet refuses to profit by the warning—for example, if a Catholic in such circumstances refuses to receive the sacraments. It would seem that in such a case the nurse could give the anesthetic if the dying person himself requests it, on the principle: *Scienti et volenti nulla fit injuria.* But if the doctor prescribes the drug on his own authority without consulting the patient, it is difficult to see how the nurse would be justified in administering it, at least if there is any reason to hope that the obdurate sufferer will repent and turn to God.

At any event, in a Catholic home or hospital it should be the endeavor of those who assist the dying to give them no greater amount of drugs than is absolutely necessary to diminish the pain, so that they may devote their last moments on earth toward preparing their souls for the great journey that lies before them.

TRANSFER OF THE *MISSA PRO POPULO*

Question: Should a pastor who celebrates a High Mass (funeral, wedding, etc.) on a day when he is supposed to say a *Missa pro populo,* and has another priest say this latter Mass, give this priest the amount of the stipend he received for the High Mass, or does he satisfy his obligation by giving him the ordinary stipend for a Low Mass?

Answer: In such a case the pastor is obliged to give the other priest only the ordinary stipend for a Low Mass, and may himself retain the larger stipend for the High Mass. However, pastors should remember that the obligation of celebrating the *Missa pro populo* is *per se* personal and should not be transferred to another priest save for a very good reason. There are decisions of the Holy See forbidding the transfer of this obligation to another priest in

order that the pastor might be free to celebrate a nuptial or a funeral Mass (Cf. Cappello, *De Sacramentis* [Rome, 1938], I, n. 650), and although conditions in our country might be such as to excuse pastors (especially those who have no assistants) occasionally from the letter of these decisions, yet, the spirit of this legislation should inspire pastors to be most exact in habitually offering the *Missa pro populo* themselves on the appointed days. It is to be noted that, by virtue of Canon 466, § 3, some of the bishops of our country permit pastors for a just reason (such as a wedding or funeral Mass) to transfer the celebration of a *Missa pro populo* to another day, when they themselves can offer it.

IS THE EUCHARISTIC FAST BROKEN?

Question: Is it permitted to give a sick person a little water immediately before he receives Holy Communion, especially if his mouth is very dry, so that he may be able to swallow the Sacred Host more easily?

Answer: We presume that the questioner is referring to a sick person who is obliged to observe the law of the eucharistic fast without any mitigation—that is, one who is not in danger of death or who is not permitted to enjoy the privilege granted in Canon 858, § 2, of communicating once or twice a week after taking medicine or liquids. With this presupposed, the question would have to be answered in the negative, presuming that the water is given him to be swallowed. He would be allowed to take some water into his mouth, to wash and to moisten it, if the water were then expectorated—even though a few drops were swallowed *per modum salivae*. Or, he could be given a drink of water immediately after he received Holy Communion, and in that event there would be no violation of the Church's law even though the water was actually swallowed before the Sacred Host. But the eucharistic fast would be broken if water to be swallowed was taken into the mouth before the reception of Holy Communion, even though there was an interval of only a few moments between the two acts.

A QUESTION OF INCOME TAX

Question: A priest celebrates a nuptial Mass, for which the approved stipend is ten dollars. Actually, the groom gives him twenty-

five dollars. In making up his income tax report, should the priest consider the entire amount as revenue, or may he record only ten dollars as such, and consider the extra fifteen dollars as a gift?

Answer: In the supposition that the groom was aware that the required stipend was only ten dollars, the extra fifteen dollars which he gave could reasonably be regarded by the priest as a gift. It would seem that the same principle could be applied to other sums added to the regular stipend for other ministerial services, such as baptisms, funerals, etc. Needless to say, the priest should be exact in the matter of his income tax report, since, according to the better view, it involves an obligation which binds in justice—at least legal justice (cf. Crowe, *The Moral Obligation of Paying Just Taxes* [Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1944], pp. 151-63).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

MATERIAL AND SHAPE OF THE MONSTRANCE

Question: What are the rules concerning the material and the shape of the monstrance? Does it necessarily have to be constructed in the fan-like form which we usually see? Could it take the shape of a Gothic tower, with pinnacles and finial ornaments, to conform to the architecture of the church? What about the liceity of stainless steel for the material of the monstrance?

Answer: The material of which the monstrance should be made is not prescribed by liturgical laws. Naturally, dignified material, such as gold or silver, or a nobler metal gold or silver-plated, should be used and not a baser metal, like lead or tin. The material need not be metal, provided it is worthy and durable. We see no objection to stainless steel. In any case, however, the rim of the lunula, which comes in direct contact with the Sacred Species, should be gold or gold plate (Cf. S.R.C., 3234, *ad* 4).

There is no legislation governing the form of the monstrance. It may be, as our correspondent expresses it, "fan-like," fashioned in the shape of rays or of a wreath surrounding the lunula, or it may be in the form of a cross, the place for the lunula being at the

juncture of the arms. The turret-like form, with pinnacles and finials, though less usual, would be quite proper and very effective on an altar of Gothic design. One detail of the shape is prescribed, however, and that is that the monstrance be surmounted by a cross, *not* a crucifix (S.R.C., 2957). Where the vessel itself takes the shape of a cross, evidently, there is no need of the surmounting cross.

We recommend that care should be taken that the lunula be of sufficient size to accommodate a large host without cutting. When the host has to be reduced in size for exposition, there is inevitable danger of the loss of particles of the Sacred Species.

USE OF THE COMMUNION CLOTH

Question: Is it still required to have a Communion cloth? Has not the regulation concerning the Communion paten done away with the necessity of a Communion cloth?

Answer: The spreading of a Communion cloth before those who are to receive Holy Communion is prescribed by the Missal *(Rit. Cel.* X, 6) and the Ritual *(Tit.* IV, *Cap.* ii, 1). The former speaks of it as *linteum seu velum album* and the latter refers to it as a clean linen cloth spread out before the communicants *(ante eos linteo mundo extenso).* Moreover, the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum (Lib. II, Cap.* xxix, 3) directs two acolytes to hold a white cloth, grasping it at the four corners, during the whole ceremony of the distribution of Holy Communion. The Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments (March 26, 1929) prescribing the holding of a paten by the communicants expressly states that the use of the white linen cloth is not thereby to be dispensed with. The Communion paten is an additional precaution against the loss of fragments during the giving of Holy Communion. The paten takes care especially of little particles which may fall from the small hosts, while the cloth is a precaution against the hosts themselves falling to the floor if accidentally dropped by the priest. The symbolism of the Communion cloth as an appurtenance of the Sacred Banquet would recommend its retention even though the practical purpose for which it was originally introduced is now better served by the paten of the communicants.

OBLIGATION OF THE *SANCTUS* CANDLE

Question: Is it still proper to light the *Sanctus* candle at Low Mass? One rarely sees this candle used yet it seems a beautiful custom to have it burning during the solemn portion of the Mass.

Answer: The *Sanctus* candle, in case you have forgotten, is a candle which the Missal (*Rub. Gen.* XX) directs should be placed on the Epistle side of the altar, to be lighted for the elevation at Low Mass. The Missal is not more definite than this concerning it. So, it may be mounted on a bracket at the sides of the altar or rest in a candlestick on the credence table. It takes the place of the torches which are used at High Mass. The popular designation of *Sanctus* candle is obviously derived from the time of lighting it. It burns from the *Sanctus* until after the Communion of the Chalice but remains lighted until after the distribution of Holy Communion, when there are communicants to receive at the Mass. The custom of lighting this third candle at Low Mass has become almost obsolete. We have never seen it in Rome but it is universal in Spain, where it takes the form of a candle in a kind of bugia, placed on the Epistle side of the altar table and conveniently advanced by the server to provide extra light for the purification of the paten at the Communion of the celebrant. A decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (No. 4029, *ad* 2) has declared the *Sanctus* candle no longer of obligation but this does not make the use of it forbidden to those who wish to retain this effective bit of symbolism.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

TO KNOW THE LIFE OF GRACE

Just as it is impossible to know the nature of the germ enclosed within the acorn unless we study it in its perfect state in the oak tree, so we cannot know the life of grace unless we consider it in its ultimate development, in that glory which is the consummation of grace. "Grace," says the whole of Tradition, "is the seed of glory."

—Father Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., in *The Three Ways of the Spiritual Life* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1938), p. 14.

Analecta

The first number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* for the year 1946 reports in full the sermon of our Holy Father delivered on Christmas Eve, 1945, in the presence of the Cardinals and the Prelates of the Roman Curia.[1] This is the sermon in which he referred to the exceptional characteristics of the consistory in which he was to elevate thirty-two prelates to the Cardinalate, namely, the fact that this would be the first consistory in which so great a number had been honored and the fact that in making these appointments he had been moved by a desire to afford representation in the College of Cardinals to as great a number of nations as possible. Moreover, in the sermon he pointed to the supranational character, the indivisible unity, and the universality of the Church, qualities that make the Church indigenous to every nation and make her the sole hope for a world united in peace, not divided in the brutality of war into which national individualism, liberalism, and their offspring, totalitarianism, have plunged and will necessarily continue to plunge it. He lamented the threat that totalitarianism still offers, as well as the lack of good faith and the unilateral manipulation of public opinion. He protested against the unjust detention of prisoners of war and political prisoners and assured them of his prayers for their prompt liberation. To all Catholics he imparted the Apostolic Blessing as a token of his prayers that Almighty God might shower abundant graces upon them.

The whole second number of the *Acta* is devoted to our Holy Father's Encyclical Letter commemorating the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the reunion of the Church of the Ruthenian Rite with the Holy See, given under date of Dec. 23, 1945.[2] The Encyclical is an admirable record of the dealings of the Holy See with the Catholics of that rite. It reads like the call of an inspired prophet to religious loyalty. It recalls the adversities through which, time after time, the loyal adherents of the Holy See, bishops, priests, and laymen, were compelled to pass because of their fidelity. Enemies from within and enemies from without, political enemies and irreligious enemies, inflicted, the Encyclical affirms, social ostracism, denial of religious freedom, deportation of priests and laymen, im-

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXVIII (1946), 15. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 33.

prisonment, and death. St. Josaphat was but the outstanding martyr of the cause. Memorable also was the group whose cause of canonization the Encyclical notices with favor, the group which formed an unarmed phalanx surrounding their church in its defense and at the cost of their lives. These fruits of martyrdom are offered by our Holy Father as an answer to the question, "What good has the union served?" But he points also to the vigorous spiritual life that has been the mark of these Catholics since the union, in contrast with the picture of chaos and dissolution that confronted its hierarchy in the period preceding it. He lauds the work of the hierarchy, of the Basilian monks and of other religious communities, especially that of Archbishop Andrew Szeptyckyj, remarkable not only for his constructive leadership in time of peace but also for his willingness to suffer martyrdom in time of persecution. The Encyclical notes that before the late war, the number of Catholics of this rite belonging to the Galican church was 3,600,000, with about five hundred thousand in other parts of the world, notably America; the number of priests serving them in Europe is set down as 2,275. In concluding, our Holy Father reports that messengers inform him that the cycle of persecution has returned; urges bishops, priests, and people to be worthy of their ancestry in loyalty to the Church; assures them of the support of his prayers, and confers on them the Apostolic Blessing.

An Encyclical Epistle of our Holy Father, issued Jan. 6, 1946,[3] called on the universal hierarchy to appoint a day of prayer for the relief of the starving children of all countries, a day on which the clergy should present to the people the needs of these children and, in the spirit of the Epistle itself, point out to their flocks the love of Christ for the little ones and the need that both Church and State have in the future of citizens not stigmatized with the physical and moral ruin consequent upon the sorry plight of undernourished childhood. Generosity should be the characteristic of the day, manifested by rich and poor alike.

A decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, dated Jan. 22, 1946,[4] extends the indult of Dec. 19, 1941,[5] granted in regard to the law of fast and abstinence. In virtue of this extension, local Ordinaries, without distinction of rite, are authorized, until further

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

[5] *Op. cit.*, XXXIII (1941), 516.

notification, to grant in their respective territories a general dispensation from the law of fast and abstinence applicable also to exempt religious, with the exception of Ash Wednesday and Good Friday in the case of the Latin Rite, and, in the case of other rites, with the exception of any two days specified by the Ordinaries. The local Ordinaries are admonished to exhort the faithful, especially the clergy and religious, to substitute voluntary works of virtue, especially of penance and charity, for the observance of the law of fast and abstinence and to pray for the Pope.

An Apostolic Constitution of April 28, 1942,[6] is reported, in virtue of which a new Prefecture Apostolic in West Africa was established to be known as "Praefectura Niameyensis." An Apostolic Constitution of July 13, 1945,[7] is also published, in virtue of which a new Prefecture Apostolic in Peru was established under the title of San José de Amazones, consisting of a part of the territory of the Vicariate Apostolic of San Leone de Amazones.

Recent Pontifical Appointments Announced in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*

Grand Cross of the Order of Pius:

June 2, 1945: Myron Charles Taylor.

Commander with Plaque of the Order of Pius:

June 18, 1945: Oakleigh Thorne, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Commander of the Order of Pius:

June 18, 1945: Winthrop Williams Aldrich, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great:

Nov. 8, 1944: Thomas A. Brennan, Michael F. Walsh, Patrick F. Scanlan, Richard F. Farley, Charles J. Dodd, Thomas A. McGoldrick, and Joseph P. Carlin, of the Diocese of Brooklyn.

Nov. 30, 1944: Bernard A. Kennedy, of the Diocese of La Crosse, and John E. Fitzpatrick, of the Archdiocese of Omaha.

Grand Cross of the Order of St. Sylvester the Pope:

May 2, 1945: Gen. Edgar Erskine Hume.

Jerome D. Hannan

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[6] *Op. cit.*, XXXVIII (1946), 11. [7] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

Book Reviews

APOLOGETICA. By G. Yelle, S.S. and R. Fournier, S.S. Montreal: Grand Seminary, 1945. Pp. xxiii + 351. $2.25.

DE ECCLESIA ET DE LOCIS THEOLOGICIS. By G. Yelle, S.S. Montreal: Grand Seminary, 1945. Pp. xiii + 173. $1.25.

These two works must be reckoned among the most valuable contemporary contributions to the field of fundamental theology. Taken together they offer an outline of a first year course in dogmatic theology remarkable both for the accuracy of its content and for the originality and effectiveness of its arrangement. Furthermore, both volumes take cognizance of current theological problems and refer to theological literature readily available both in the United States and in Canada. They are books which teachers and students of fundamental theology cannot afford to ignore.

The most striking feature of the *Apologetica* (which, incidentally, carries an excellent preface by Archbishop Yelle, S.S., the Rector emeritus of the Grand Seminary and the brother of one of the co-authors) is the order in which it presents its teaching. Whereas the manuals of apologetics hitherto most widely used in our seminaries proceed from a study of the nature of apologetics, through a consideration of the nature, the qualities, the possibility and the necessity of divine revelation, to the establishment of the theses about Our Lord's divine mission in the world, Doctors Yelle and Fournier completely reverse this sequence. They devote the first section of their volume (that written by Dr. Yelle) to establishing the fact of Our Lord's divine messengership and to proving that He has established the Catholic Church. The second section (Dr. Fournier's) is given over to the study of the concept of revelation and of the motives of credibility considered as such. The teaching on the nature of apologetics, together with a worth-while inquiry about the preaching of apologetics to Catholics and about its use in the apostolate to non-Catholics are treated in an appendix.

The *De ecclesia et de locis theologicis* is also a corporate work. The sections on the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ, on Catholic Action, and on the relations between Church and State were written by Dr. Fournier. The remainder of the volume is from the pen of Dr. Yelle. The chapters *de locis theologicis* are based on the course given by Archbishop Yelle while he was an active member of the theological faculty of the University of Montreal.

Dr. Yelle's volume is certainly one of the first important and theologically complete treatises on the Church to have been produced since the publication of the *Mystici Corporis*. This encyclical, which is appended to the work, influences every section of it. The uniformly high quality of Dr. Yelle's doctrine is a splendid manifestation of the good which the *Mystici Corporis* has accomplished in the field of ecclesiology.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS AND PROBLEMS. By John F. Cronin, S.S., Ph.D. New York: American Book Company, 1945. Pp. xv + 623. $3.75.

As a critical exposition of the economics of modern America, this is an excellent book. Dr. Cronin has a remarkable gift of lucid and accurate writing. In his hands economics is no dismal science but a very vital and interesting subject. He is never too technical but he is always technical enough to be accurate. Although his general viewpoint is more or less that of the New Deal, he carefully avoids special pleading and constantly tries to be fair to his opponents. His excellent bibliographies and his abundant concrete illustrations reveal his very thorough grasp of his subject. He is always too realistic to be betrayed into extreme or one-sided economic theories. The book is markedly better than his earlier *Economics and Society* (1939) which was itself an excellent piece of work.

Yet Dr. Cronin's fine book has a weakness and this weakness occurs at the point where one would least expect to find it, namely, in his exposition of the background and content of Catholic social thought. It was misleading, first of all, to use the term "social" thought; for his material is usually economic, sometimes political, but scarcely ever touches upon such topics as international relations, race relations, crime, population, and the like, which are conventionally included under "social" thought. Yet even in the narrower field of Catholic economic thought the treatment leaves much to be desired.

There is a page or so on the social thought of the Old Testament, mentioning in a general way the doctrine of the prophets and of the Psalms, but it occurs, rather surprisingly, in a section headed *The Social Thought of Judaism*. The term "Judaism" is restricted by scholars normally to post-exilic Jewish religion; so this material is largely out of place. It is strange, too, that Dr. Cronin should document this brief treatment by references to a modern Jewish source instead of turning to the work of Catholic scholars and the Old Testament itself. His treatment of the New Testament is even more inadequate.

The one point that he makes is that the early Christians did not practice absolute communism. This is true and significant but it is hardly the most important single point in the social thought of the New Testament.

In dealing with the Fathers Dr. Cronin is definitely misleading. He says:

> The *Church of the Christian Fathers* was hardly an integral and influential part of society. Too often the Christians were a *gens lucifuga,* fortunate to escape the terrible toll of persecution. Such a group was in no position to play any real part in the society of its day. Accordingly, no effective social theory can be found in the writings of that period (p. 565).

The Patristic period is conventionally considered to extend in the West to the death of St. Isidore of Seville (636) and in the East to the death of St. John Damascene (749). At least during the second half of this period the Christians had ceased to be a *gens lucifuga.* Their part in society was not only real and effective, but dominant. Their social thought, and even their specialized economic thought, was extraordinarily acute and effective. To prove this point one has only to turn to the abundant literature on the subject, for instance, to Seipel's *Die wirtschaftsethischen Lehren der Kirchenväter* which has already become a classic.

The thought of the Middle Ages is more adequately treated, although it is confined rather narrowly to St. Thomas and gives the reader little hint of the extraordinary richness and variety of medieval social thought from John of Salisbury to Nicholas of Cusa. In dealing with the earlier part of the modern period Dr. Cronin says, "The main developments in 'social' thought were more in the line of *politics* than economics" (p. 581), and devotes a few lines to the political thought of Bellarmine and Suarez. It is misleading to imply that this was a blank period in Catholic economic thought. On the contrary, it was precisely the time when Catholic moralists were coming to grips with the problems of developing capitalism. For one thing, it was the classic period of the controversy over the morality of interest, a problem so absolutely fundamental for the criticism of the capitalistic system. Emanuel Maignan, whose life overlapped Bellarmine and Suarez, laid down essentially the modern doctrine in his *De usu licito pecuniae.*

In expounding modern papal social doctrine, Dr. Cronin confines himself exclusively to three popes, Leo XIII, Pius XI, and Pius XII, and almost exclusively to three documents, the *Rerum novarum, Quadragesimo anno,* and *Divini Redemptoris,* which, he asserts, "constitute the *primary sources* for the treatment of Catholic social principles" (p. 538, italics in original). It would be more theologically accurate

to say that the "primary" sources of Catholic social doctrine, as of all Catholic doctrine, are the *fontes revelationis;* but let that pass. In any case, an exposition of papal social doctrine based almost entirely on three documents is necessarily very one-sided and incomplete. It was certainly a mistake to pass over in complete silence the work of Popes Pius IX, Pius X, and Benedict XV, whose cumulative contribution was extremely important.

It is extraordinary that the book has so little to say about spiritual techniques of social reform and that, when they are mentioned, it is always with the warning that their importance should not be overemphasized. One might retort that neither should Dr. Cronin underemphasize their importance. Certainly the popes have not hestitated to lay the very greatest stress on spiritual weapons against social evil. For example, the *Divini Redemptoris* asserts that "the evil which today torments humanity can be conquered only by a world-wide holy crusade of prayer and penance." This strong papal emphasis on spiritual techniques is scarcely reflected in *Economic Analysis and Problems.*

If this review has been somewhat critical, it is pleasant to close it with a deserved compliment. Many persons have expounded Catholic social doctrine more adequately and more accurately than Dr. Cronin, but his economic analysis of modern America is superb. The reviewer's Department of Sociology at The Catholic University of America has just voted unanimously to make *Economic Analysis and Problems* required reading for all graduate students. The reviewer would certainly not have voted for that measure unless he had been very sincere indeed in his admiration of Dr. Cronin's work.

PAUL HANLY FURFEY

CAEREMONIALE, PARS PRIOR, DE MINISTRIS. *Editio Quinta.* By J. F. Van de Stappen, revised by Aug. Croegaert. Mechlin: H. Dessain, 1945. Pp. xiv + 483.

The present volume is the fifth edition of Bishop Van de Stappen's classic *Caeremoniale.* It is the revision of that work by A. Croegaert, former professor of Liturgy in the Seminary of Malines. This is the first in a series of ceremonial books and is restricted to the duties of the ministers, major and minor, and the general rules governing the actions of those assisting *in choro* at sacred functions. All the special ceremonies of the year, including those of Holy Week, are comprised in the volume but no pontifical functions, except Pontifical Mass at the faldstool and Solemn Mass celebrated *coram Episcopo.*

The instructions for the participants in liturgical ceremonies are divided into four sections: the first detailing the duties of thurifer,

acolytes, and torch-bearers; the second treating of the office of the master of ceremonies; and the third and fourth setting down the parts of the subdeacon and deacon. The usual arrangement, common in ceremonial books which detail in separate chapters the rôles of the various officers, is observed also in this volume. However, special treatment of solemn functions which are conducted *coram Sanctissimo Sacramento* distinguishes these instructions. Under the duties of deacon and subdeacon are included those of the *pluvialistae* at Solemn Vespers. (Deacons and subdeacons in levitical vestments are of course anathema at Vespers.) For Palm Sunday and Good Friday, all possible variations are considered for the chanting of the Passion, whether this be done by special deacons or performed by the ministers of the Mass, with or without the celebrant. While the author has in mind primarily the dispositions of the chapel of the Seminary of Malines, the directions are of quite general application.

One distinctive feature of this ceremonial is a series of bibliographies, liturgical, historical, and dogmatic, appended to the introductory chapters. These provide a satisfactory conspectus of the literature concerning the blessings of candles, ashes, and palms, the ceremonies of Holy Week, and the rogation processions. The classic treatises on these subjects appear in the bibliographies with the addition of up-to-date books and articles and a number of not so-well-known contributions of Belgian and Flemish authorship.

The exigencies of war-time book production must account for the heavy paper and bulky format of the volume, which comes to us paperbound and uncut.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU.

THE PRIEST OF THE FATHERS. By Edward L. Heston, C.S.C. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1945. Pp. 171. $2.50.

Fr. Heston's book is upon a subject that is perennial in its importance and therefore it is most opportune today. Its title indicates its general character and its table of contents shows its plan. Divided into three parts—"The Priest and God," "The Priest and the People," and "The Priest and Himself"—the work presents the doctrine of various Fathers upon these subjects as addressed to bishops and priests of their own day. The author's method is to present the words of the Fathers and of later theologians upon the topic at hand and then to synthesize them and apply them particularly to the priest of today. Thus he concludes his chapter on "The Unchanging Priestly Ideal" with the following fine summary.

The substance of the ideal of the eternal priesthood, then, remains forever the same. The minister of God today in the large cities or the isolated mission posts of the United States must, no less than Polycarp at Smyrna, exhort all men unto salvation, keep watch in the possession of a sleepless spirit, bear with all men in charity, and devote himself to unceasing prayer. With the ideal priest of St. John Chrysostom he must realize that the whole world is entrusted to his keeping and so comfort himself as if he were the father of all men. No less than the priest of Gregory the Great, his vocation is so to live that he may water with refreshing streams of doctrine the parched hearts of his brethren and by the assiduous practice of prayer obtain peace and prosperity and all other good things for those under him. Even more today than in the days of St. Bernard, the faithful priest is called upon to develop a mind and a will which are free, noble, righteous, cautious, watchful, steadfast, and invincible, so that his enemies and God's enemies may live in continual and salutary dread of his reproofs. In our age particularly the priest must heed St. Thomas' admonition to have a good conscience before God and a good name among men. Even for the seemingly different practical aspects of priestly life and activity of today, we can find in our Fathers many practical lessons, all the more valuable for being in such close contact with the unchanging ideal of Christ. The Fathers' ideal of the priesthood has not grown old or outmoded with the centuries, because it is the ideal of Christ, the eternal High Priest.

Fr. Heston has done a genuine service to the clergy by gathering together the passages that he quotes from Fathers, theologians, philosophers, and popes and by commenting upon them in so enlightened and enlightening a way. His volume should prove to be a permanent addition to the library of books upon the priesthood. It should as well inspire its readers to inquire further into the sources that are quoted so abundantly. As His Excellency, the Most Reverend Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, the Apostolic Delegate, says of the Fathers in his preface to the work: "Their very names spell greatness: Ignatius of Antioch, Cyprian, John Chrysostom, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory the Great, Leo the Great, and, in later years, Bernard and others." It is greatness that is needed today and it can come in part from the words and example of the titans of earlier centuries.

JOHN K. RYAN

PERSONALITY FACTORS IN COUNSELLING. By Charles A. Curran. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1945. Pp. xx + 287.

This is a doctoral dissertation, written under the direction of Dr. C. R. Rogers, then of Ohio State University, now of the University of Chicago. In the main it is a report on a single case, giving detailed descriptions of many interviews and discussing the various factors and situations determining the client's behavior and problems. Dr. Rogers

teaches what he calls a "client-centered technique" of counselling which is also characterized as "non-directive." The basic idea is that the task is to be done by the client himself, and that the counsellor should limit his activity to mere encouragement, eventual interpretations, and generally, to helping the client in finding his own expressions and the way out of his difficulties.

In so far as the book gives a careful account of this procedure, it is a valuable illustration of Dr. Rogers' notions. Although some other cases, most of them also studied by Rogers' pupils, are mentioned, the book would have gained definitely had it not been limited to the discussion of one case and if it had considered the indications of the particular procedure. It would also be better if the question were raised of the range of applicability of this "non-directive counselling." As things are presented, one is easily led to believe that this method can be used with all cases needing or seeking counsel. Now, it is true that many counsellors go too far in imposing their personal views on the client and do not allow him to work out his problems. But, on the other hand, this reviewer doubts very much whether this procedure will prove helpful in all cases. There are many who do not know anything about their problems at all; they have no problems, but suffer from symptoms. If one allows them to talk at will, they never reach the fundamental issues, because all they know how to talk about are their symptoms. In truly graver cases of neurosis, *e.g.,* compulsion and similar troubles, I am afraid this method will not prove effective.

G. C. Jung once said that mental treatment has four degrees: speaking out and self-clarification (corresponding to the method advocated by the author); explanation, that is, helping the client realize how his troubles are related with his total personality and life; re-education, that is, teaching him an effective technique of life and pointing out to him attainable goals; and finally something Jung calls "rebirth" and what one may also name "conversion," not of course, in a strictly religious sense, although such a conversion may indeed represent the summit of restoration to normalcy. However useful "non-directive" counselling is, in certain instances, it cannot replace the more developed forms of mental treatment. I also believe that there are certain moral obstacles; one can hardly admit that an individual's self-found solution will represent always a satisfactory solution; there is the moral law too. Neither do I believe that the "counsellor-centered" procedure is as common, at least with well-trained medical psychologists, as the author seems to assume. To let the client do the talking, to help him along, to avoid premature explanations, and not to impose one's own ideas at an early time on the client—these are rules every experienced psychotherapist automatically observes. If there is an overgrowth of

undue activity on the part, to use Dr. Kanner's phrase, of the "more zealous psychologists," it is not in accordance with the approved principles of medical psychology.

For the rest, this book will prove instructive to many readers. The presentation of the theoretical ideas concerning the interrelation of the various problems and attitudes in the client's personality is, perhaps, not as clear as one would wish; to follow the author is not always easy. But the work is indubitably a valuable contribution, and suggestive in its minute description of technique.

RUDOLPH ALLERS, M.D.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the September, 1896, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* a writer who signs himself simply "An English Catholic" narrates the discovery, in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, of an eleventh century manuscript containing a transcript of a missal which seems to have been brought to England from Rome by St. Augustine in 596. The painstaking task of verifying the authenticity of the transcription was performed by Mr. Martin Rule, a convert from Anglicanism. . . . Continuing his series on *Clerical Studies,* Abbé Hogan writes on "Church History." Emphasizing the importance of this branch for the priest, he asserts: "After the inspired writings, nowhere can he find instruction more abundant, maturer wisdom, more stimulating examples. In a word, to no other intellectual pursuit can his hours of leisure be more delightfully and fruitfully devoted" . . . . Continuing his articles on "The Unpublished Letters of Archbishop Seghers," Fr. W. Stang quotes at length from the correspondence of the zealous missionary when he was still a young priest in Western Canada. In writing to the Rector of Louvain, Father Seghers complains bitterly of the laxity of some of the priests in the matter of keeping and reading heretical books. . . . The "Analecta" contains the Latin text of the Encyclical *Satis cognitum,* which had been given in the vernacular in the preceding issue. . . . In a reply to a question regarding the reception of converts it is stated that baptism conferred in certain non-Catholic churches, particularly the Lutheran and the High Church of England, may be presumed to have been valid, though in individual instances doubt could be cast on them. (With the "liberal" ideas on the nature and efficacy of baptism that are now so prevalent among Protestants, at least in the United States, it is very questionable if the administration of this sacrament by any Protestant clergyman can be regarded as certainly valid.)

F. J. C.

Book Notes

Although his reign was short, Gelasius (492-96) is one of the most significant and outstanding Popes in early Christianity. He is a pivotal point in the history of the relations of Church and State. In recent years writers are giving him the attention and space that he deserves. (Cf. *The Catholic Historical Review*, XXVII [1942], 412.) It is now a pleasure to welcome a linguistic study of Gelasius. *The Syntax of the Letters of Pope Gelasius I* constitutes the doctoral dissertation of Fr. Philip V. Bagan, O.S.B. (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1945. Pp xxiii + 231. $2.50). The work presents a thorough treatment of the syntax under the following headings: Gender and Number, The Cases, The Adjective and Adverb, The Pronoun, Prepositions, The Nominal Forms of the Verb, The Syntax of Independent Clauses, The Syntax of Subordinate Clauses. In a summary Fr. Bagan states that Gelasius' latinity is generally classical, that the author is a very conservative writer, and that Gelasius as a writer belongs to a literary tradition of artificiality that goes back to the Classical Age. On Pp. xxii f. there is a handy concordance table of the letters of Gelasius arranged according to the editions of Thiel, Guenther, and Schwarz. Indications are likewise given as to which letters are spurious. A linguistic study of this kind will be a help to scholars who have to work with these letters. It will be of great value for a further study, namely, the comparison of the latinity of Gelasius with that of his predecessors, Popes Felix III and Simplicius.

Several publications in recent years have stressed the universality of the obligation of tending to Christian perfection. A new addition to this kind of literature is *A Primer of Perfection for Everybody*, by James Meyer, O.F.M. (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1946. Pp. viii + 184. $1.00). The book is intended primarily for Franciscans living in convents or in the world. However, every Christian will benefit by its reading, just as every Christian is inspired by the example of St. Francis. The book is no more than a primer, a book for beginners. It does not teach everything, only basic elements of the spiritual and religious life. There is sound doctrine in a simple and popular form that will appeal especially to lay persons.

Others Will Come, by H. J. Heagney (St. Nazianz, Wisconsin: The Society of the Divine Saviour, Salvatorian Seminary Publishing Department, 1945. Pp. vii + 234), is an inspiring sequel to *Victory*, a biography of the saintly Father Jordan, founder of the Society of the Divine Saviour. *Victory* traces the life of Father Jordan from his birth up to the time of founding of the Society of the Divine Saviour; *Others Will Come* depicts in novel form the life of this holy priest from the time of the founding of the society to his saintly death. The story of his struggle against overwhelming odds throughout his life, and especially for the recognition and ecclesiastical approbation of the society which he had founded and ruled for thirty-four years is an inspiration to anyone laboring in the vineyard of God. For it was such undying perseverance that let him see the day when his society began to spread throughout the world in fulfillment of the prophecy which he made many times throughout his saintly life: "Others will come and be mindful of our sufferings and continue the work."

Sr. Mary David, S.S.N.D., has translated *The Practice of the Presence of God* by Brother Lawrence of the Resurrection (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Book Shop. 1945. Pp. 127. $2.25). Five small chapters make up the book. They contain a brief sketch of the life of this discalced Carmelite who in his early years served his country as a soldier and who died in the service of God as a lay-brother. The brother

himself speaks in the last chapters through personal interviews, maxims, and his own letters. The outstanding feature in his life, as noted in the title, is the practice of the presence of God, "mute familiar conversation with him." The book itself is no great contribution to spiritual literature but may act as a stimulus to a practice fundamental to a genuine spiritual growth.

To the growing list of accurate and inspiring literature on Catholic Action which has come out of Canada of late years, Fr. Michel Doran, O.P., has contributed *L'Action Catholique* (Montreal: Les Éditions du Lévrier, 1945. Pp. 190). The work takes up in two parts the nature and structures of Catholic Action. Under nature is treated the basic element of Catholic Action, namely, sacramental grace. The chapters in this first part trace out in detail the spiritual groundwork of Catholic Action, the pertinent virtues, and their expression in organizational forms. In this section there is some excellent material for conferences to Catholic Actionists present or prospective. In the second part attention is given to the structural forms of Catholic Action, its operating functions, relations with auxiliary activities, and so forth. The last chapter, while dealing directly with specialization in terms of the Catholic Scout Movement, contains many observations and motivations applicable to any Catholic Action project.

Robert Farren, though only thirty-six, already has four creditable books of poetry to his name. The most recent, *Rime, Gentlemen, Please* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1945. Pp. 110. $2.00), puts him among the very first of living Irish poets. His idiom is modern, though with a fine, free handling of the traditional technique, his images are solid, and there is no touch of the sentimental or the bombastic. The short verse play, "Lost Light," is a revelation of Mr. Farren's talent for terse, powerful, and eloquent drama, and the lines move with conversational grace, and brief, splendid poetry. If Mr. Farren's audience is limited, it is due to his occasional obscurity—a weakness few modern poets have escaped. One might wish that many of the argumentative poems had been omitted, though it is obvious that these will have a deep emotional interest for readers who are familiar with the sad and turbulent history of Ireland.

Caryll Houselander, author of that moving and almost mystical *This War is the Passion,* follows up the splendor of that work with a book of poems, *The Flowering Tree* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1945. Pp. 144. $2.00). Although some of the poems strike the reader as prose arranged in rythmical lines, the body of the book is plain and genuine poetry that comes pretty close to the less ethereal forms of mysticism. If the reader likes his poetry in sharp concentration of idea, image, and feeling, he will not relish the book as a whole. But it was Miss Houselander's intention to write for those who prefer their poetry in simple language and spacious development.

The "story of the U. S. Army Chaplains" is still to be written. Christopher Cross' book *Soldiers of God* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1945. Pp. 236. $2.75) is merely an approximation in the guise of a panoramic view of chaplain activities on widely scattered fronts, and in various attitudes from holding services in foxholes to contacting parents back home. In a sense, the burden of the book was meant to be a portrayal of chaplains in close contact with their men—in field and ditch, under fire and in hospital wards, in all times, places, and circumstances. To that extent it is a successful book. There is however no real thesis to the book; hence it cannot be looked upon as a history of the Army Chaplain Corps. It could hardly be such, considering the absolute line of cleavage existing between Catholic priests as chaplains, and the chaplains of every other denomination. Mr. Cross in no way alludes to this distinction, although it is a fact that might have made his book much more valuable had it been